

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

It is at least to some extent true to say that in recent times the focus of New Testament studies has begun to move away from the Fourth Gospel, on which it was so long concentrated, to the Lukan part of the New Testament writings. It was therefore extremely fitting that Dr. C. K. BARRETT should take the Lukan writings as the subject of his A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture.¹ Although Dr. BARRETT's book is officially the record of a lecture it is in fact rather a short monograph on the Lukan writings.

To begin with Dr. BARRETT poses six questions in regard to these writings. First, when we study them, what text are we to use? Are we to use the Old Uncial text as it is in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, or are we to use the Western text, with all its additions and omissions and variations as it is in Codex Bezae? Dr. BARRETT would commit himself to neither text, but would attempt to settle each case on its merits.

Second, Luke is an historian, but what kind of an historian? Clearly he is not a scientific historian in the modern sense of the term. Does he satisfy Lucian's view of what history should be—'scientific inquiry into the past with a view to the greater wisdom of future generations' or, is he an historian who is more concerned to advocate a cause than to transmit the facts?

Third, Luke was a particular kind of historian; he was a religious biographer. How is he related to such writers as Philostratus in his life of Apollonius of Tyana? Philostratus presents Apollonius as carrying out a public ministry in which he healed the sick, raised the dead, cast out demons, and preached the good news—a startling parallel with the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel. 'The Hellenistic romance may make

¹ *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net).

some claim to being the literary setting of the Lucan writings.'

Fourth, what is Luke's connexion with Judaism and the Old Testament? Whence come the Semitisms in his language? Much more important, is he writing history as a Jew would write it? The Old Testament writers begin with the conviction that they know the truth about God, and they write, not to establish a result, but as men who had reached a conclusion, and whose one aim is simply to illustrate it. 'They wrote history as a confession of faith.'

Fifth, what are we to say of Luke's Christian background, and of the sources which he used? In the Gospel we know from his own statement that he used many sources. In the Acts he is often much less clear, and the reason may well be that he is writing the story of the earliest days of the Church with the presuppositions of a later time.

Sixth, what kind of ecclesiastical background is visible through Luke's writings? Here we can see a double picture, sometimes like a screen on which two pictures are being projected at the same time, for, as it has already been stated, Luke shows us much of the history of the earliest days, but often with the presuppositions of his own day.

If it be one of the great duties of scholarship to ask the right questions, then Dr. BARRETT has certainly contributed very highly to the scholarly study of the Lukan literature.

Having asked his questions, Dr. BARRETT outlines and examines briefly but helpfully the work of six modern scholars on the Lukan writings; the work of the late Martin Dibelius, of Dr. Bertil Gärtner, Dr. Arnold Ehrhardt, Dr. Robert

Morgenthaler, Dr. Hans Conzelmann, and Dr. Ernst Haenchen is passed in review. Since large parts of this work have not yet appeared in English this is a most helpful section.

Dr. BARRETT in his final section has something constructive to say. In this section we will fasten on one point which is of the greatest interest. In one sense Luke is quite unique among the New Testament writers. All the other writers stand consciously on one side or the other of that great watershed which is marked by the life, the death, the resurrection of Jesus. Mark, for instance, does not go beyond that, and Paul starts just where that stops, and, if we only possessed the letters of Paul we would know next to nothing of the earthly life of Jesus. Luke alone stands on both sides of the watershed.

This unique position of Luke is very significantly seen by his attitude to the Ascension, with the story of which he ends his Gospel and begins Acts. The Ascension is the end of the earthly life of Jesus and the beginning of the life of the Church. Therefore, the end of the story of Jesus is the Church.

Now this involves a new eschatology. For Luke Jesus does not stand at the end of time; He stands in the *middle* of time. It is quite true that the time which follows the resurrection of Jesus is for all New Testament thought the *last* time. But for Mark and for Paul the emphasis is on *last*. For Luke this *last* chapter of history is also a *new* chapter of history. Jesus is at once the End and the Beginning. 'He is not the close of all history, but the starting-point of a new kind of history.' And the new kind of history is *Church* history. This is what gives Luke his unique place in the New Testament. 'He is the Father of Church History; it had not occurred to any Christian before him that there was any such thing.'

Here is a conclusion which is full of interest. If we read the meaning of this aright, it will mean that there are really four kinds of eschatological thinking in the New Testament at least. There is the thinking which expected the immediate Second Coming as, for instance, in the Thessalonian letters. There is the thinking which still thought in the same visible and outward terms, even if the event was delayed, as in Second Peter. There is the Johannine conception of the coming of Christ being actualised in the coming of the Spirit to the loving and obedient heart. And now we have this Lukan conception of a last chapter in which the Church actualizes that which Jesus

made possible, and in which the Second Coming has not vanished, but in which the time of the Second Coming is no longer a primary question.

Under the circumstances of a lecture, Dr. BARRETT could give us no more than a sketch, but it is a masterly sketch with all his characteristic meticulous and wide-ranging scholarship, orderly arrangement, and lucid expression. We can pay Dr. BARRETT's lecture no higher tribute than to say that A. S. Peake would have rejoiced to read it.

The characteristic temptation for the Christian to-day is to give up the struggle with the world. The revival of theology in the Church makes it no longer possible to identify the Kingdom of God with the benefits of a new social order; but there is a danger that in insisting on the uniqueness of gospel truth we may make it irrelevant to the modern world. Again, the Church is concerned with God and the rule of God: it is not merely an institution for civilizing men; yet in asserting these truths we are tempted to forget that God rules over the whole world. He is not only active in the things that go on in ecclesiastical buildings. He does not forget the world's concerns, and neither should His people.

Another reason for Christians retreating from the world, says the writer whom we have been following,¹ is a frustration in Christian social thinking in Britain. Too often Christians have set themselves to find specifically Christian answers to social problems; but this has proved a blind alley leading only to pompous platitudes which are no guide to action. Hence many people, who still insist that the Church cannot abandon its concern for the world, have in practice done so because they cannot see any definite Christian answers to the world's problems. It might seem that theologians ought to be able to provide a synthesis of divine and social truth, a general map of humanity's journey which should guide us every step of the way; yet in fact such a synthesis has not proved possible, society being too complex and the human mind too small. That is not to say, however, that there are no Christian social principles. There may not be one pattern of a Christian social order valid for all time and all places, yet there is a wide consensus of opinion about the Christian standards and principles by which a Christian should judge the arrangements of the social and economic order to-day, and these

¹ D. L. Munby, *God and the Rich Society* (Oxford University Press; 25s. net).

principles and standards may also guide in some measure as to action.

Instead of asking what these principles and standards are and what guidance they give, our author prefers to ask four questions. The first is, What is happening in the middle of the twentieth century? Are there any economic trends discernible? While human beings create societies and institutions, these in their turn mould human beings. Moreover, while human beings die, the institutions and habits of thought persist, linking the present to the past and in a measure determining the future. Even deliberate revolutions, once the tumult is over, settle down into patterns which show remarkable continuity with the past. One may hope therefore to estimate what are the trends in societies and institutions in a given period. No doubt generalizations of this kind are risky, but they ought to be possible in the economic field, for a characteristic feature of economic life is that technical knowledge is embodied in means of production which often last for many years. Such knowledge and machines, leading to further knowledge and better instruments of production, are a characteristic example of irreversible social processes.

The second question is to ask What positive achievements can be seen in these trends from a Christian perspective? The human ideals and endeavours that make a certain pattern of society are a compound of good and evil; but even where the reality of man's sin is more obvious than the more positive achievement, we need still to be aware of the positive aims and ideals which may be dimly seen in the perversions, for, in so far as these positive aims and ideas inspire the trends, we can find the hand of God in them.

This leads to the third question, What is God doing in the economic order in the middle of the twentieth century? The appropriateness of the question cannot be doubted by a Christian who believes that God is at work outside His Church as well as within. It is a question specially difficult

to answer to-day, for much that is clearly anti-Christian in the modern world equally clearly partakes somewhat of the long tradition of Christian culture. Yet if God is Lord of history He ought to be seen providentially at work through and in the web of human relationships, though it may need one like the Old Testament prophets to declare His mighty acts.

The fourth question follows at once, What shall we do? We are changing the structures of our society by our day to day decisions. It is for us to make decisions so as to contribute to the ends towards which God seems to be working, so fashioning society more in accordance with His will.

It may clarify this approach if we take an example. In a modern industrial system one fundamental trend is towards greater community and equality; and our author believes that Christians can recognize in this the hand of God, even when it is secular groups and secular forces that call them to welcome greater community between men in particular ways and greater equality in incomes, power and prestige. That ought to be no surprise to those who know that the Lord God is greater than the parochial deity we often worship in our parishes. What the trend towards equalization of incomes and status means within Western lands is important, and our author has much to say about it; but more important at present is it to decide what Christian concern means as regards fair shares between the richer nations and the 'under-developed' countries. 'If I were asked', he says, 'what were the major issues on which I should like to see the churches concentrating their thought and efforts . . . I would answer that it was the question of the use and abuse of our rich expanding economy, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the problems of the poverty of the mass of mankind. I would be bold enough to state dogmatically that I am sure we would be more nearly obeying the Will of God for us in our generation if we were to devote to these matters a tithe of the effort and resources we now devote to other concerns . . .'

The Prophet Jesus—I.

BY THE REVEREND H. McKEATING, M.Th., THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

'And the multitudes said, this is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee.'—Mt 21¹¹ (R.V.).

PROFESSOR CULLMANN in his *Christology of the New Testament* has called our attention again to the importance of the title 'Prophet' as given to our Lord. He deals almost exclusively with the idea of Jesus as *The Prophet*, that is, the prophet who should come at the end time. On pp. 43ff. he considers the conception of Jesus the prophet as a solution to the New Testament Christological problem. The chief limitation of the conception in Professor Cullmann's opinion is that the prophetic office is too narrow. 'The prophet is, at bottom, simply the preacher of repentance at the end of days'. Professor Cullmann is no doubt right, for his purpose, to restrict his attention to those texts which speak of Jesus as the eschatological prophet, but this is not the only sense in which Jesus is said to be a prophet. It is of interest to look at those passages in the New Testament in which Jesus is regarded as 'a prophet like the prophets of old'. The prophet, in this wider sense, is a good deal more, as I hope to show, than a preacher of repentance. Even thus extended the prophetic office is of course still too narrow adequately to describe our Lord. Nevertheless, although He was 'more than a prophet' He was *at least* a prophet, and there is something to be gained from looking at Him in this light, as one of the prophetic line. Our developing conceptions of the person and work of the Old Testament prophets may give us a little help in understanding the person and work of Christ; and it is not impossible that, conversely, the Old Testament prophets may themselves be illuminated by our regarding Jesus as one of their sons.

Not surprisingly, Jesus was frequently thought of during His lifetime as a prophet. The soliloquy of Simon the Pharisee, 'If this man were a prophet . . .' (Lk 7³⁹) implies that Jesus was popularly given that title, and the same is borne out in sundry places (Mt 16¹⁴ and parallels, 21¹¹ 21¹⁶, Mk 6¹⁵ and parallel, Lk 7¹⁶, Jn 7⁴⁰).

On the Emmaus road (Lk 24¹⁹) two of Jesus' own disciples use the word prophet of Him quite naturally and apparently without any feeling of inappropriateness.

By implication Jesus calls Himself a prophet, or at least puts Himself in the same category with the prophets, when He says 'A prophet is not without honour . . .' (Mt 13⁵⁷ and parallels) and

'It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem' (Lk 13³³).

In the Fourth Gospel the woman of Samaria calls Jesus a prophet (4¹⁹) and He does not correct her, though He shortly reveals to her that He is in fact Messiah. The man born blind calls Him prophet before the Pharisees (9¹⁷) and again there is what might be an implied correction when Jesus makes it known to him that He is Son of Man (9³⁵⁻³⁸).

Nowhere outside the Gospels is Jesus referred to by the name of prophet. Indeed, in Ac 3²⁶, after speaking at some length about the prophets of time past, Peter expressly contrasts Jesus, God's latest messenger, with them, calling Him *pais*. If we add this evidence to that of the Fourth Gospel we may conclude that the Church quickly decided that the title of prophet, though naturally enough given to Jesus during His earthly ministry, was indeed too narrow to describe the risen and ascended Lord.

Nevertheless, bearing the limitations of the title in mind, let us see what is to be learnt of Jesus as a prophet.¹

Jesus' Teaching Methods

Jesus' characteristic methods of teaching are unique. 'No man ever spoke like this man.' But this is not to say that His methods have no antecedents. In His use of imagery and parable Jesus is developing methods which the prophets had used before Him, and His closest affinities as a teacher are with them.

The prophets, and in particular Amos and Jeremiah, frequently put across their message by flinging into the listener's mind an image, a *mashal* or likeness, having one point, one point of comparison with the situation which they are talking about; a plumbline—judgment (Am 7¹¹); a basket of fruit—an end (8¹¹); a pot boiling over—disaster (Jer 1^{13f.}); a cistern, broken even before it is completed—wasted effort (2¹⁸).

The images can be built up into a series, all making the same point, like Jeremiah's images in 2²³⁻²⁵; the restive young camel, the wild ass in heat—lust; the prostitute—lust degenerate, joyless but compulsive. This whole section of

¹ This subject has been explored by C. H. Dodd in 'Jesus as Teacher and Prophet' in *Mysterium Christi*, ed. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann [1930].

Jeremiah (^{2⁹-3⁷}), is a single series of images, changing with bewildering rapidity but all reinforcing the same message, the incredibility of the idea that the people should sin against such a God as theirs. Amos (^{3²-8}) in more concentrated fashion builds up a similar series.

Close to the prophetic pattern are some of our Lord's images—a city set on a hill, a lamp put under the bed. And even some of the parables, though a little more extended than these brief sayings, are closely related, the heart of them consisting of a single image, a dragnet, a harvest field, a handful of yeast.

The more extended parables of Jesus, whose centre is not a single image but a story, have fewer direct parallels in the prophets. There are a few places in the prophets where the instructive story is used, for example, the allegory of Ezk 16. But the story in Ezk 16 is most unlike the parables of Jesus. If it were not so well written we would have to call it wordy. Jesus never treats any story at this length and never appears to allegorize. Ezekiel's other tale of Oholah and Oholibah is in the same category as the one already mentioned.

The only piece of prophetic writing which we could call a parable in anything approaching the New Testament sense of the word is Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard (Is 5). It is not allegory but true *mashal*, a parallel. This is not quite the same as a simile, the vineyard is not merely *like* Israel: there is an organic connexion between the vineyard and Israel. In the case of the vineyard and its relations with its *baal* we see the same factors at work as in the relation between Israel and Yahweh. The vineyard is a microcosm of Israel as the field in which the sower sows is a microcosm of the world, or the harvest field is a microcosm of the judgment.

This is what makes a parable in the New Testament sense of the word, that the image used should show the same processes going on and the same forces at work as does the larger phenomenon to which the parable calls attention. The use of the parabolic method implies a philosophy. Science bases itself on the philosophic assumption that the disparate phenomena of the natural world can be united and explained in accordance with a single principle, that of natural law. Jesus, and most of the Biblical writers with Him, make a parallel assumption, but the uniting principle here is not an immutable natural law but a consistent divine will. The scientific assumption is that the ultimate realities are impersonal: the Biblical assumption is that the ultimate realities are personal.

Thus when Jesus or the prophets use an image in their teaching they are not merely using simile. Granted their assumptions, they are using logical argument. In practically all prophetic or dominical

imagery there is an implicit argument *qal wahomer*, from lesser to greater. As the scientist might explain the working of radio by reference to the ripples on a pond Jesus explains God's attitude to men in terms of a parent's attitude to his children. In each case the parallel does not owe its aptness to a merely superficial resemblance between the two phenomena but to identity of principle. The ripples on the pond are only a more readily observable and intelligible example of wave motion than are radio waves; they are not, that is, an example of a similar thing but of the *same thing*. Likewise the parent giving his children what is good for them is a more readily observable and intelligible example of how a person acts towards what he loves. God, too, being a person, must act thus towards what He loves.

Prediction

There is, all through Old Testament prophecy, a predictive element. When a prophet first appears on the Old Testament stage in the person of Samuel (we ignore Moses, who is in a class by himself) he appears predicting events. He predicts both trivial events (' You will meet two men by Rachel's tomb . . .' [I S 10²]) and large (' And you shall reign over the people of the Lord, and you will save them from the hand of their enemies round about' [I S 10¹]).

And almost every prophet that follows is recorded as having made some prediction, both false prophets (1 K 22⁶) and true: from the early ecstasies like Elijah (' There shall be neither dew nor rain . . .' [I K 17¹]) to the later, most far sighted and most ' spiritual ' of them all (' The former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them' [Is 42⁹]). From the words of Dt 18²² we see that prediction was expected of every prophet and that it was by the truth of his predictions that he was judged.

Jesus is a prophet in this most ordinary sense. He does not scorn the predictive office. As the great pre-exilic prophets had predicted the fall of Samaria in 722-721 and of Jerusalem in 586 Jesus predicts the fall of Jerusalem that took place eventually in A.D. 70 (Mk 13¹⁻², and parallel, Lk 19⁴³⁻⁴⁴ 21²⁰⁻²⁴). And it is probable that His so-called threat to destroy the Temple, of which such different accounts are given, was originally no more than a prophecy of this sort.

Again, as the Old Testament prophets do, Jesus predicts smaller things, things either trivial in themselves or important only to the individuals to whom they happen; ' before the cock crows . . .' (Mk 14³⁰). If we could believe that Mk 11², ' You will find a colt tied ', and Mk 14¹⁸, ' A man carrying a jar of water will meet you ', were genuine

predictions rather than matters arranged beforehand by Jesus then these too would come into the same category. We might also place in this class the unfulfilled prediction of Mk 10³⁹ about the manner of death of James and John and the words, not exactly a prediction at all but a piece of clairvoyance, 'you have had five husbands . . .' (Jn 4¹⁸).

In matters of more significance, Jesus predicts His betrayal (Mk 14¹⁸) and His betrayer (Mt 26²⁵, Jn 13²⁸). But above all, He predicts His own death and resurrection. The references to this last are too well known to demand mention of all of them; suffice it to remind ourselves of Mt 16²¹ 17¹² 26². Further, Jesus predicts for the time after His death the persecution of His followers (Mk 13⁹⁻¹³ and parallels, Mt 5^{11f.} and parallel).

It will be perceived that most of these predictions are of such a sort that Jesus could have made them without using abnormal powers. If Jesus had possessed no supernatural gifts He could have made most of these prophecies on the basis of an intelligent appreciation of situations and characters. For example, when Jesus says 'You will all fall away, for it is written "I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered"', He could be prompted not by an inspired foreknowledge but by a sound understanding of His disciples' characters. Or again, Jesus' prediction of the fall of Jerusalem could surely have been made by any reasonably far-sighted observer of the contemporary political scene.

We have not said anything here about Jesus that could not with equal justice be said about the Old Testament prophets. Let us take two examples from the career of Isaiah of Jerusalem to illustrate the way in which they arrived at their conclusions.

Isaiah's prediction of the future of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition could have been given by any shrewd political commentator of the period (Is 7, especially 7¹¹; cf. 2 K 16). It should have been clear even to Ahaz that whether or not the coalition was strong enough to damage Judah its action could not be ignored by Assyria, who would have been bound to interfere. The prophet's advice therefore coincides with the advice of practical wisdom and there is no reason why the methods by which he arrived at his results should necessarily be different from those of the hypothetical commentator mentioned above.

On the other hand, the prediction and advice offered to Hezekiah on the occasion of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah, when the Assyrian was already at Jerusalem's gates and no apparent prospect of salvation remained, could not have been given by any political commentator in his right mind (2 K 19, Is 36-37).

This is not to say that the prophet is using any

different method of forecasting from the one used in the former case, nor that even here he is necessarily using any 'sixth sense'. He is, as he did previously, weighing up the facts of the situation and predicting the future course of events from them. In the former instance his conclusions agreed with those of enlightened secular wisdom. Why do they now disagree? It is because the prophet and the secular politician are weighing different kinds of evidence. The prophet has taken account of all the factors that the non-prophet takes account of, but he also considers others which his rival does not consider at all. In the former case these other factors only confirmed the final result, in the latter they lead to an entirely different one. The prophet gives weight to moral and religious factors which the common-sense man dismisses as of no political or military significance. For Isaiah, in the present case, an important factor in the situation is that the King of Assyria has said rude things about Yahweh. Yahweh will therefore rescue His people because His honour demands it.

This brings us back to the point to which our consideration of the teaching methods brought us, that Jesus and the prophets seriously assume that the ultimate realities are personal realities. Events are determined therefore not by the laws of chance and of physical necessity but by consistent divine purpose.

This capacity of the prophets to consider moral and religious facts as seriously relevant to practical situations appears perhaps more strikingly still in Amos. Amos prophesied the end of the Israelite state when there was no apparent political justification for such a prophecy. His conviction does not spring at all from an intelligent reading of the international situation but from two quite different observations, the behaviour of Israel, which merits punishment, and the character of God, which ensures it. Amos' prophetic method reveals itself as a simple willingness to make reasonable deductions from moral and religious observations. At one point he appears to disclaim the supernatural insight that regular prophets boasted, 'No prophet I!' (7¹⁴). And the well-known passage in 3⁸⁻⁸ shows us why he can make this disclaimer; the facts of the situation from which Amos argues should be clear to every one, prophet or no. The snare springs; you need be no prophet to realize something must have set it off. The lion roars; you need be no prophet to realize it must have caught something. The alarm is sounded; you need be no prophet to realize that something must be wrong. When facts speak for themselves there is no need to resort to prophecy. Very well—says Amos—the facts stare us in the face, I only draw the obvious conclusions. When the Lord

God speaks as clearly as He is doing to-day any fool can prophesy.

Jesus at one point takes just the same attitude to prophecy (Lk 12⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸ and parallel Mt 16²¹). 'You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times'. In the Lukan context the saying refers to the apocalyptic 'signs of the end'. In Matthew the saying is delivered in response to a demand for a sign. The meaning is much the same in either case. Men ought not to require any special revelation in order to see what God is doing or about to do in the world. God speaks sufficiently clearly in the events of the times for every one who has eyes to see. 'The Lord God has spoken, who can but prophesy?' (Am 3⁸).

All this is not to suggest that Jesus and the prophets possessed no faculty, of the sort denied to most of us, enabling them to see into the future—the probability is, I believe, that they did—but that in more cases than we often imagine their conclusions were reached without the exercise of any such gift. Their prophecies were for the most part deductions, but not merely the deductions of 'common sense'. 'Common sense' as generally understood does not take seriously the fact of God, or of His activity in the world in judgment and salvation: prophecy does. Prophecy therefore depends in the main not on the exercise of any abnormal gift but on the exercise of faith.

If I may digress a little from the main point in order to labour the obvious, this means, if it is true, that the most important functions of prophecy are not reserved for those with special insight but are open to every one who has faith. Just as there is a priesthood of all believers there is also a prophethood of all believers. 'Would that all the Lord's people were prophets'.

Intercession

Prediction may have been to the contemporaries of the Old Testament prophets the prophets' most obvious function, but it was not their only recognized function. Almost equally important was that of interceding for their clients. It was no doubt assumed that the prayers of a man of God would carry more weight than those of an ordinary Israelite.

There are numerous occasions in the Old Testament when a prophet is reported to have prayed for his people, but we need not consider them all. The significant references for our purpose are those that make it clear that intercession was not something done now and again, by this prophet or that, but a regular, normal, expected part of the prophet's job.

Three times Jeremiah tells us that God has forbidden him to pray for his people (7¹⁶ 11¹⁴

14¹¹). In the contexts in which Jeremiah says this he is trying to bring home to the people the terrible seriousness of their sins and the absolute inevitability of their punishment. And this is the extremity of God's abandonment of them, that He has even forbidden His prophet to pray for them. The whole force of Jeremiah's argument rests on the fact that it is unheard of for a prophet *not* to pray.

In Jer 15¹ the prophet goes on in the same strain, 'Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people'. It is implied that these two greatest of prophets accepted intercession as part of their work. On two famous occasions (Ex 32^{10ff}, Nu 14^{13ff}) the Torah tells us that Moses interceded for his people. And it is reported in 1 S 7⁸ how Samuel's contemporaries take it for granted that he too will intercede. In 1 S 12²³ Samuel himself makes the same assumption.

When Hezekiah at the time of Sennacherib's siege first sends to Isaiah the mission is important enough for him to include in his deputation the senior secular officials of the court together with the senior priests, to include, that is to say, all the most important people in the country apart from the King himself. Yet they are not commissioned to ask either advice or predictions. They ask nothing but the prophet's prayers.

Enough has been said to show that intercession was looked on as a regular and necessary part of a prophet's activities. The prophets had, of course, no monopoly of intercession, but we must not on that account overlook the fact that it was strongly characteristic of them.

Jesus, too, prays often, and though we are hardly ever given much information about the substance of His prayers we may take it for granted that intercession made up a large part of them. When we are given by St. John (ch. 17) what is alleged to be the substance of a prayer of His we find it to be nearly all intercession. He prays for His disciples, 'the men whom thou gavest me', and for that wider circle of all who would make up the body of Christ, 'those who are to believe in me through their word'.

However little we know of the details of the prayers of the earthly Jesus this intercessory function of His was sufficiently characteristic of Him to be seized on by the Church after His death as a fitting way to express His whole saving work. 'We have an advocate with the Father' (1 Jn 2¹), 'Christ Jesus . . . who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us' (Ro 8³⁴).

[In Part II of this article Mr. McKeating will discuss another phenomenon met with amongst the Old Testament prophets which he describes as enacted prophecy. Mr. McKeating suggests that this throws light on our Lord's words and work.—EDITOR.]

Recent Biblical Theologies

II. Rudolph Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL J. C. FENTON, M.A., B.D., THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, LICHFIELD

VOLUME i. of the English translation was published in 1952, and Volume ii. in 1955. I read them in the years in which they came out; re-read some of the sections, in particular those on Paul and John, from time to time; and have recently read the complete work right through for the purpose of this article. How do one's present-day reactions to the book compare with those of six or nine years ago? And how has it stood up to criticism and further research?

1. Perhaps one of the most notable aspects of the book on the first reading was the apparently extreme position which Bultmann adopted on critical matters. The late Dr. T. W. Manson, reviewing vol. i. in *The Journal of Theological Studies* (l. 204), said of the section on *The Message of Jesus*, '... all the really important historical events have been consigned to the realm of the legendary: Peter's confession, the Transfiguration, the Baptism and the Temptations, the Triumphal Entry, and to a large extent the Passion'. Similarly, the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians, Colossians and Ephesians was not accepted. Moreover, Bultmann denied that Jesus believed that He was the Messiah or the Son of Man, or the Suffering Servant. These and other critical opinions seemed extreme and drastic to English readers at that time, dominated as we were by a more conservative attitude. To-day, on the other hand, I believe they seem less shocking. The climate has changed. One might compare, for example, Dr. John Knox's *The Death of Christ* [1959] which adopts very similar positions to those of Bultmann on many points in the Gospels; and M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* [1959].

On the other hand, Bultmann's view that there have been a number of interpolations in the Fourth Gospel has not, so far as I know, received much approval. He says, for example, 'The sacraments were subsequently introduced into the text by editorial process (3⁵; 6^{51b-58})' (ii. 9); and 'A later ecclesiastical redaction has here added "on the last day", "correcting" the text by introducing the traditional futuristic eschatology, just as it did in 6³⁹, 40, 44 by inserting the refrain "but (or "and") I will raise him up at the last day"' (ii. 39). One feels that here Bultmann has emended the text to suit his inter-

pretation of it, without adequate evidence for the emendation; but for this evidence, no doubt, we must turn to his commentary on John, which is still not translated into English.

2. Secondly, one now notices certain omissions from the book which appear, to the English reader at least, to be serious. For example, the synoptists are never adequately or seriously treated as *theologians*. There are only brief references to the Gospel of Mark and the Gospel of Matthew (ii. 124 f., 142) and to 'Luke (as historian)' (ii. 116, 126). The work of scholars such as J. H. Ropes, R. H. Lightfoot and A. M. Farrer seems to have passed unnoticed. In the same way, Hebrews and The Apocalypse are not interpreted sympathetically; for example, 'The Christianity of Revelation has to be termed a weakly Christianized Judaism. . . . the author does not reflect upon the past which in Christ has been brought to its end and out of which believers have been transplanted into a new beginning. Hence the present is understood in a way not basically different from the understanding of it in the Jewish apocalypses: namely, as a time of temporariness, of waiting. The clear symptom of this understanding is the fact that *pistis* is essentially conceived as "endurance", as in Judaism' (ii. 175). One cannot help thinking that Bultmann has missed the point of much of the imagery of The Apocalypse; for example, the sealing of the saints in ch. 7, the Lamb and the hundred and forty-four thousand on Mount Zion in ch. 14.

3. The quotation above concerning the meaning of *pistis* in The Apocalypse is an example of another characteristic of Bultmann's method which strikes the reader as he goes through the book for a second time: I mean, his use of the study of words and their meaning. This is particularly noticeable in part four, *The Development toward the Ancient Church*. Again and again he asks whether the Pauline or Johannine words retain their same significance in the other writers, and finds that they do not. He holds up the author of the Pastoral Epistles, of Hebrews, 1 Peter, James, etc., to Paul and John, and compares them linguistically; for example, in their use of such words as Sin, Flesh, Faith, Spirit. He neither allows these writers to speak for themselves, nor recognizes (so it seems) that they may be saying

the same things by means of different words, or by means of the same words used in different senses. Here again one senses a lack of sympathy with some of the Biblical writers, and a slavery to a somewhat wooden lexicographical method.

4. Criticisms of the same kind can be made of Bultmann's treatment of the early Christian use of the Old Testament. There is an extremely useful section in vol. i. on *The Church's Relation to Judaism and the Problem of the Old Testament* (108 f.) in which he lists the six 'most important types of possibility' in which this relationship could be understood, and then sketches 'the resulting picture'. But again one does not feel that he has any sympathy with a certain typological approach to the Old Testament, such as that put forward by certain English writers. And this lack of sympathy, perhaps, blinds him to the extent to which the Old Testament understood typologically did influence the New Testament writers themselves. For example, he says at one point, 'In contrast to Matthew, Mark did not write the story of Jesus with constant reference to prediction [i.e. the Old Testament], and in John the history-of-salvation perspective is completely absent' (ii. 122); and 'Fulfilment of prediction is of minor importance in his [Mark's] Gospel and occurs in pure form only at 4¹², though 7^{6f.}; 9¹²; 11^{9f.}; 12^{10f.} are related', and adds in a footnote 'Mk 1^{2f.} is probably an ancient gloss' (ii. 125). It is certainly true that in Mark the fulfilment of the Old Testament is less obvious than in Matthew; but this is only one aspect of Mark's subtlety as a writer. Mark's Passion narrative is full of Old Testament allusions, and so also is his narrative of the ministry.

A further example of Bultmann's under-estimation of the influence of the Old Testament, which also provides an example of his frequent recourse to Hellenistic ways of thinking, is the following quotation from a section on *The Sacraments* in ch. 3, *The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church aside from Paul*:

'But to the three interpretations of the sacrament of baptism—purification, sealing by the Name, and bestowal of the Spirit—still a fourth and very important one is added: *Baptism imparts participation in the death and resurrection of Christ*. This interpretation undoubtedly originated in the Hellenistic Church, which understood this traditional initiation-sacrament on analogy with the initiation-sacraments of the mystery religions. The meaning of the latter is to impart to the initiates a share in the fate of the cult-deity who has suffered death and reawakened to life—such as Attis, Adonis, or Osiris.'

'This interpretation, by which baptism was furnished with a hitherto missing reference to

the salvation-occurrence, is clearly a secondary one, for the ceremony of baptism was in no wise adapted to serve as a reproduction or dramatization of what had happened at Jesus' death and resurrection. Jesus did not die by drowning; neither did the earliest Church consider baptism "a drowning of the old Adam" as Luther did. This interpretation could attach itself to baptism only because it was, after all, the Christian sacrament of initiation; and so it came to be explained as a Hellenistically understood initiation-sacrament. Such an interpretation is foreign to Old Testament-Jewish thinking, for it knows no cultic acts based on the fate of the Deity and intending to bring its effect into the present, but only such as have their basis in the history of the People. To understand Jesus' fate as the basis for a cult, and to understand the cult as the celebration which sacramentally brings the celebrant into such fellowship with the cult-divinity that the latter's fate avails for the former as if it were his own—that is a Hellenistic mystery-idea' (i. 140).

The strange thing about this quotation is the omission of any reference to 1 Co 10^{1ff.}: 'I want you to know, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea'. Was there any need to call in 'a Hellenistic mystery-idea', when the Jewish passover lay to hand? Contrast, for example, W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* [1948], 'It is not impossible then, that his [Paul's] conception of the dying and rising with Christ by which the Christian individual re-enacts in his own experience the life of Christ as it were, is derived from the same world of thought as is indicated for us in the liturgy of the Passover, where the historical event calls for personal appropriation by the individual Israelite, i.e. just as the true Jew is he who has made the history of his nation his own history, so the Christian is he who has made the history of Christ his own' (p. 107); and Davies goes on to argue, against W. L. Knox, that this is not an Hellenistic conception which has passed into Judaism.

Yet another possible example of Bultmann's under-estimation of the influence of the Old Testament was pointed out by T. W. Manson in his review of the second *Lieferung* (*The Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., iii. 247 f.) when he wrote, 'So we come to the Word (*Logos*) which is not to be derived either from the Old Testament or from Greek philosophy, but from "the tradition of a cosmological mythology which also influenced Judaism and particularly Philo". . . . I venture to think', Dr. Manson continued, 'that the

Old Testament has much more to do with the Logos doctrine in John than the author is prepared to allow'. The same may be true of other parts of Bultmann's exposition of the New Testament.

Let us consider now the proportions of the book as a whole, since this has often been criticized. It is roughly as follows :

The Message of Jesus	30 pages
The Kerygma of the earliest Church	30 pages
The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church aside from Paul	120 pages
The Theology of Paul	166 pages
The Theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles	90 pages
The Development toward the Ancient Church	157 pages

The points which are open to criticism in this are first, the small amount of space devoted to the Message of Jesus ; secondly, the large amount of space given to the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church.

Bultmann's defence on the first point is in the opening paragraph of the book. It must be quoted in full because of its importance :

'The message of Jesus is a presupposition for the theology of the New Testament rather than a part of that theology itself. For New Testament theology consists in the unfolding of those ideas by means of which Christian faith makes sure of its own object, basis, and consequences. But Christian faith did not exist until there was a Christian kerygma ; i.e., a kerygma proclaiming Jesus Christ—specifically Jesus Christ the Crucified and Risen One—to be God's eschatological act of salvation. He was first so proclaimed in the kerygma of the earliest Church, not in the message of the historical Jesus, even though that Church frequently introduced into its account of Jesus' message, motifs of its own proclamation. Thus, theological thinking—the theology of the New Testament—begins with the *kerygma* of the earliest Church and not before. But the fact that Jesus had appeared and the message which he had proclaimed were, of course, among its historical presuppositions ; and for this reason Jesus' message cannot be omitted from the delineation of New Testament theology' (i. 3).

It is probably true to say that there is no complete agreement yet on the answer to the question, Did Jesus proclaim Himself or was this first done by the earliest Church ? Some of us will incline to Bultmann's view, that the decisive step was taken after the Resurrection : 'He who formerly had been the *bearer* of the message was drawn into it and became its essential *content*.

The proclaimer became the proclaimed' (i. 33). Nevertheless, there are two comments which might be made in criticism of Bultmann's treatment of *The Message of Jesus* : first, although Jesus Himself may not have entertained or expressed Christological ideas, is there not an implied Christology in His words and deeds ? Secondly, might it not have been helpful if Bultmann had devoted some space to the consideration of the question, Is the fundamental and basic faith which is called for by Jesus the same as that which is called for by the earliest Church ? Bultmann does indeed say that he will answer this very problem : 'This question, however, cannot be set forth and answered in advance, but must be developed and answered in the presentation of Paul's theology itself' (i. 189). Nevertheless, one could ask for a clearer treatment of this at some point in the book.

The other point in the over-all proportion of the book is the large amount of space given to *The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church*, to which Dr. Manson drew attention in *The Journal of Theological Studies* (l. 203) : '... we are given an imaginary picture of the beliefs and practices of a hypothetical Hellenistic community. It is admitted . . . that for the making of this picture there is scarcely any direct evidence available, and that consequently whatever is produced must be essentially the result of "reconstruction" '. I think it must be admitted that this is a weakness in the book. Yet Bultmann is attempting something that others before and since have attempted : to show the relationship between Paul and his Predecessors ; to isolate what is specifically Pauline from what is traditional. The 'reconstruction' is brilliant, and is performed with great skill ; but one remains uneasy about it.

In spite of the foregoing criticisms, I believe that Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament* is a great book, and, in the main, a very sound book and a very useful book. There are three reasons why I believe this.

First, I believe that its *method* is a good method. At the end of vol. ii. there is an *Epilogue*, in which Bultmann considers among other things, *The Task and the Problems of New Testament Theology*. He says there :

'The question may be raised whether it is more appropriate to treat the theological thoughts of the New Testament writings as a systematically ordered *unity*—a New Testament system of dogmatics, so to say—or to treat them in their *variety*, each writing or group of writings by itself, in which case the individual writings can then be understood as members of an historical continuity.'

'The second procedure is the one chosen in the treatment here offered. By this choice the opinion is expressed that there can be no normative Christian dogmatics, in other words, that it is not possible to accomplish the theological task once for all—the task which consists of unfolding that understanding of God, and hence of the world and man, which arise from faith, for this task permits only ever-repeated solutions, or attempts at solution, each in its particular historical situation' (ii. 237).

With regard to method, this seems extremely sound. From one point of view there is no such thing as 'The Theology of the New Testament'—a single system, made up by putting together the ideas of different writers. Theology is not that kind of science. And we miss the real point of much of the New Testament if we use it to produce a New Testament system of dogmatics. (One only wishes that Bultmann had carried out this principle further, and applied it to Hebrews, The Apocalypse, the Synoptists, etc.)

Secondly, I find particularly helpful the way in which Bultmann puts *questions* which the historical continuity raises. For example, at the end of ch. 2 on *The Kerygma of the Earliest Church*:

'The questions which arise for the future are : How will the eschatological-transcendent character of the Congregation assert itself against its ties with the Jewish people without tearing its ties with the history of salvation ? How will the idea of tradition and succession take form ? Will the Word remain the constitutive factor ? And what institutions will be created to give order to tradition and the life of the Congregation ? How in all of this will the relation of the Congregation to the person of Jesus be conceived ?' (i. 62).

See also, for example, i. 163, 181 f.; ii. 126, 129, 158, 161, 199, 219 f. These questions help us to see what the real problems were, and to grasp what the New Testament writers say as answers, or attempted answers, to live issues. They show how 'the individual writings can . . . be understood as members of an historical continuity' (ii. 237).

Finally, Bultmann says in the Epilogue that the purpose for which he wrote the book was the interpretation of the New Testament to the man of to-day. 'The reconstruction stands in the service of the interpretation of the New Testament writings under the presupposition that they have something to say to the present. . . . That is just the reason why it was so urgent to interpret the theological thoughts of the New Testament in their connexion with the "act of living"—i.e. as explication of believing self-understanding. For they claim to have meaning for the present not as theoretical teachings, timeless general truths, but only as the expression of an understanding of human existence which for the man of to-day also is a possibility for his understanding of himself—a possibility which is opened to him by the New Testament itself, in that it not only shows him that such self-understanding is the reply to the kerygma as the word of God addressing him, but also imparts to him the kerygma itself' (ii. 251).

Bultmann's book is addressed to the man who wants to hear the gospel. For this reason it is right that it should adopt a sceptical point of view on the very points in which it is sceptical. And perhaps it is for this reason also that it has not, so far as I am aware, been welcomed as it deserves to be by those who are in positions of authority within the Church.

Literature

GENESIS

THE appearance in English of a large-scale commentary on the Book of Genesis is a very welcome event, and the more so since it is a work by an Old Testament scholar of international reputation—*Genesis: A Commentary*, by Professor von Rad, tr. John H. Marks (S.C.M.; 50s. net). Knowledge of the work of Professor Gerhard von Rad for those who do not read German has been sadly limited by the small amount that has as yet been translated, though there is a prospect of more to come. The result is that direct knowledge of the wide range of his perceptiveness in Old Testament problems has been difficult of access, and the English reader has been too much dependent on

summaries of his work or indications of his influence.

The Book of Genesis offers broad scope for the display of his point of view. He builds here on the one hand upon the literary critical tradition of the Graf-Wellhausen type—the hypothesis is by no means so dead as some would have us believe—though with no rigidity of application and with a great deal of sensible recognition of its limitations. On the other hand, there is clear his indebtedness to the form-critical approach, particularly of Gunkel, and to the historical understanding of the school of Albrecht Alt. But charging all this with vitality and breadth of understanding is his stress upon the credal basis of the Yahwistic work which has set the tone for the theological presentation

of Israel's traditions. Von Rad devotes a good part of his introductory section to this, and to the way in which he sees the Yahwist as a creative author whose work, of course, extends far beyond Genesis. The result of this is that in the minutiae of commentary the reader does not lose sight of the broad theological issues.

The discussion of textual and linguistic matters is reduced to a minimum ; this is appropriate to the kind of commentary which this is, for it belongs in its original German to the series 'Das Alte Testament Deutsch', designed as a theological commentary for clergy and laity alike. It appears now in English as the second volume of the S.C.M. 'Old Testament Library', and other volumes from the same commentary series are also to appear uniform with this.

The combining of careful and exact commentary, in which problems of text and meaning are sufficiently discussed, with consideration of the broader theological issues, is not an easy task. Too often we get the one without the other, or the attempt is made—as in the 'Interpreter's Bible'—to separate exegesis and exposition, with the result that the latter consists too often of pious remarks around the text, not really related to it. Here both are present, and, in spite of the conclusion to the introductory chapter which suggests that we are to have typological comment, in fact von Rad's appreciation of the total theological outlook of Yahwist or Elohist or Priestly author does not permit him in the detailed commentary to add little bits of unrelated Christian comment as has happened in some other volumes of this same commentary series. Theological commentary all too often is thought to mean theologizing on the basis of a text. It may then be good theology, but it is not necessarily good commentary. Here we have balanced commentary ; it gives us at the same time many insights into the depths of von Rad's own theological thinking. But it is commentary, and our reading of the Book of Genesis will be accordingly the richer.

Von Rad does not write easy German ; the translator's task is therefore difficult. The English reader will sometimes have to struggle, for the Germanic order sometimes intrudes, and there are some odd favourite words, such as 'lapidary'. But it is good that we have this important book available to a much wider circle of readers.

PETER R. ACKROYD

THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS

Study of the Gospel of Thomas, one of the important gnostic manuscripts discovered at Nag Hamadi, is carried forward by Dr. Bertil Gärtner's *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas*, tr.

Eric J. Sharpe (Collins ; 21s. net). The title of the book is inadequate, for of the two parts which it contains the former (occupying seventy pages) is headed 'The Literary Character of the Gospel of Thomas', and in this part, as well as in the other, which is explicitly devoted to theology, the author has a contribution to make. It is true that his study of literary form leads Dr. Gärtner to theological conclusions. For example, he argues cogently that the form of the Gospel of Thomas is unique (p. 30). No other Gospel proceeds in the same way from one saying of Jesus to another, with no intervening narrative. Why should the sayings thus be abstracted from their narrative context ? To prepare them 'for a different theological interpretation than the New Testament provided' (p. 34) ; clearly a gnostic interpretation. The way in which texts are conflated points in the same direction, and some features of the work recall Valentinus and Marcion.

Observations such as these form a starting-point for the theological interpretation of the Gospel. It is a significant feature of Dr. Gärtner's book that he recognizes that the Gospel of Thomas is fundamentally a gnostic work, dominated rather by the author's didactic interest than by any respect for the tradition of the words of Jesus. After looking in some detail at the Prologue—

These are the secret words spoken by the living
Jesus,
And Didymus Thomas wrote them down.
And he (Jesus) said :
He who finds the interpretation of these words
Shall not taste death—

which in itself clearly reveals a gnostic cast of thought, Dr. Gärtner analyses the material under the following heads : The Nature of Jesus ; The World and Man in the World ; The Nature of Man ; The Kingdom ; The Negative Attitude to the World ; Seeking and Rest. Jesus is the Revealer, who appeared in the flesh and gave men salvation by communicating to them knowledge of the heavenly world. The human soul is pre-existent, and is enslaved as a spark within matter ; the body, like the material world of which it is part, is to be overcome and abandoned. The chapter on the Kingdom is particularly interesting, because it brings out a characteristic gnostic reinterpretation, or rather distortion, of a Biblical eschatological concept.

Dr. Gärtner's exposition of the Gospel of Thomas as a gnostic book is based upon detailed study of the logia of which it is composed, in the light of (approximately) contemporary literature. If it were rearranged, it could be set out as a commentary on the Gospel (of the hundred and fourteen logia only fourteen are not discussed) ; thanks to

an index of logia it can be used in this way. As an exegete the author has done valuable service; he has also done well to place the Gospel of Thomas firmly in the context of second-century Gnosticism. It may well be more interesting to the public, but it is in fact far less profitable, to consider it as a possible source for information about Jesus which may supplement or even correct the canonical Gospels.

C. K. BARRETT

A NEW LIFE OF CHRIST

No life of Jesus, written in sincerity and in love, can fail to have something to say. In *The Stranger of Galilee* (Arthur James; 15s. net) the Rev. Reginald E. O. White, M.A., B.D., has given us—in the sub-title of the book—"A New Portrait of Christ".

It is as well to say what this book is not and does not do before we say what it is and what it does do. It has nothing to say on background, on geography, on Palestinian life and customs. It hardly ever makes any attempt to meet any difficulties in the gospel story, as, for instance in the case of miracles or the Resurrection. There is no real attempt to construct a life of Jesus, or even to make a dramatic pattern. And one of the most attractive features of the book is that Mr. White wastes no time in defending or attacking the views of any other writer.

This book is really witness far more than apologetic. It deals far more with significance than it does with facts. It is, if one may put it so with no thought of criticism, preaching and devotion rather than theology and research. Mr. White speaks of "the mighty, moving thing that happened in Palestine long ago and reverberates still through all the centuries", and his object is to bring that divine event into the lives of his readers—an object in which he will surely succeed.

Mr. White has a real gift for bringing out significances. He sees three reasons behind the miracles. The first is simple compassion; the second is the assertion of divine victory; the third is that Jesus aimed at the salvation of the whole man. He has a chapter on "Conversations with a Purpose" in which there are little cameos of the talks with Nicodemus, Simon the Pharisee, the Rich Young Ruler, and the Woman of Samaria. He speaks of four Resurrection appearances of Jesus, one to James who typifies the enquiring mind; one to Peter who typifies the penitent heart; one to Mary Magdalene who typifies devoted love; one to Paul whose was a heart "long ploughed with deep thought, high striving, dark defeat and passionate sincerity". He sees four facts about living in a Resurrection world. It is to live in a world where Jesus is our con-

temporary, a world where Jesus has conquered death, a world where Jesus, and all He stood for, triumphed, a world in which Jesus is still at work.

This is not a technical life of Jesus, but it does very humbly and very graciously expound the meaning of Jesus from a basically conservative standpoint, and it does apply that meaning to life and living.

On p. 10 it is a mistake to speak of the Septuagint as having been in the time of Jesus "newly translated into a world language"; the LXX was begun nearly three hundred years before Jesus came into the world. On p. 11 the first line of Matthew Arnold's poem is not, "And o'er the heathen world disgust", but "On that hard Pagan world disgust". On p. 49 *Tiberias* should be *Tiberius*. On p. 155 there are certain doubtful allusions. Rutherford's most famous imprisonment was in Aberdeen, not Edinburgh; Kagawa's plunge was into the slums of Kobe, not Tokio. These are trifles which can easily be corrected in future printings, and in no way detract from the value of a very beautiful book from which every reader will rise with a closer view of Jesus.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THE SPIRITUAL WAY

It is not only in the temporal sphere that we are experiencing at this moment the need for co-ordination and the breaking down of isolation in closer industrial and commercial relations, drawing Britain into a Common Market. In the spiritual sphere, too, the need is all the greater for a comprehensive review of theology and for a re-statement of the Faith in its wholeness. The two planes of man's existence react upon one another.

To this end we welcome from across the Channel a further book by the French Catholic, Jean Daniélou, *Christ and Us*. The English translation is by Walter Roberts (Mowbray; 30s. net). The title in English hardly conveys the wide scope of the book under its French title, *Approches du Christ*; but it takes up again the plan of the previous book, "God and Us". The aim of the present work, says the author in his Preface, "is to provide a kind of Summa"—a comprehensive survey of Christian speculation concerning the Incarnate Word of God. It seeks to do in a compressed form for the theological thought of our time what Thomas Aquinas sought to do for the Church of the Middle Ages. That may seem too big a claim for so short a book, but its sweep is great, its learning wide and its compression masterly.

The French title indicates the method of the book. Again quoting the Preface, he says, "It would appear at first sight that it deals with

heterogeneous subjects belonging to different disciplines. We pass successively from exegesis to dogmatic theology, from Biblical theology to spirituality. There is danger that this will disconcert the reader. This is precisely the intention of the book.' He aims, in fact, at breaking down the compartments which, under the legitimate pretext of separating one method from another, eventually divide up the very subject with which they are concerned. The historians, for example, strive to reconstruct the life of Jesus and to place it once more in its historical context, and do so by setting aside the supernatural element as being foreign to their method. The result is the opposition of the Jesus of history to the Jesus of faith, while in reality it is 'the one and the same Word of God who is at the beginning, who will come again at the end, and who fills the whole space in between'.

A book which focuses thought upon the Person of Christ as this book does will lift all who read it up, beyond their own personal or sectarian approaches. As we read it we are in the presence of a mind that has been strengthened in its own faith, not by turning a blind eye to new knowledge from recent discoveries, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, or to the questions raised by the attempts to sort out the literary forms upon which the writings of the New Testament depend, but a mind which is itself held, from day to day, within the knowledge of Christ present within the sacramental life of the Church, the extension in time of the Incarnate Word of God. True, when he writes of what is Catholic and Apostolic in the chapter on 'Christ and the Church', he narrows the reference to the Roman Catholic Church, but the vision of the book as a whole, far from being narrowing, is comprehensive and enlarging. A book of this quality from across the Channel must be a stimulus to an equally creative theology on this side. He who begins to read this book will remain to pray.

We turn to another book published this year—*The Mystical Life: An Outline of its Nature and Teachings from the Evidence of Direct Experience*, by Dr. J. H. M. Whiteman (Faber and Faber; 30s. net). This book also arises out of the needs of the time. The materialism of the age has provoked an awakened interest in the spiritual life. How far this book will satisfy seekers it is hard to say, and it is impossible to do justice to it in a short review. Dr. Whiteman's own experiences are very strange indeed, but that may be because we in the West are almost completely strangers to them; not strangers altogether to the spiritual life, of which he knows much, but to the phenomena which are incidental to it, and of which he seems to have had in thirty years a remarkable acquaintance. There will be those who will value this book because of the evidence it seems to

provide of other states of being. Others will read it out of sheer interest and curiosity, but they may be led, as the writer himself was led, to ponder more deeply upon the mysteries of existence. From the Christian point of view its value lies in the fact that it brings together mystical knowledge, Christian and non-Christian, from East and West; and not least because of the stress the author lays, out of his own experience, upon the essential response from within the inner life to the action of God upon it. Recollection, Meditation, Obedience; the continual death to self and the going-out of the soul towards God and others; all these and a quickened love for all other creatures and sensitiveness to their needs, have marked his own awareness along the spiritual way.

MICHAEL GIBBS

SUNDAY

Almost every denomination has wrestled in recent years with the problem of Sunday Observance. Two world wars, the advent of the motor car and the new mass means of communication have caused the question of what may or may not be done on Sunday to be hotly debated, not only in church courts, but in popular papers and in many homes—not least perhaps in manses! It is not a question the non-churchgoer can ignore. He cannot help but notice that in certain parts of the country activities which are perfectly legal on other days become illegal on a Sunday. If he fishes for salmon, drinks beer in a local hotel, or buys groceries, he is liable to find himself prosecuted.

It is curious that on such a burning issue there are practically no good modern books. Bishop Wilson's 'The Lord's Day' was nearly a hundred and thirty years old when it was republished in 1956. The British Council of Churches' Report, 'Sunday Observance and Legislation', is valuable, but is intended to deal with only one aspect of a many-sided problem. There should therefore be a very warm welcome for a most interesting, complete and well-written book—*Sunday: Christian and Social Significance*, by Mr. William Hodgkins (Independent Press; 21s. net).

With a wealth of references, Mr. Hodgkins examines the whole question from the Old Testament background to Sunday Special and Sunday Break on Television in our own day. He gives a vast amount of material not easily obtained elsewhere in a digested form. He gives a complete picture of the complex situation as regards Sunday Trading, for example. For the first time in such a book account is taken of the impact of the new mass means of communication. Generous appreciation is expressed of the—on the whole—generous treatment of religion by the B.B.C. and the I.T.A.

Some of the statistics given are quite staggering in their significance. Over forty per cent of the British public read 'The News of the World' as compared with less than four per cent who read 'The Sunday Times'. Attendances of Protestants at church in the city of York fell from fourteen thousand in 1901 to six thousand eight hundred in 1948, while the population rose from forty-eight thousand to seventy-eight thousand.

In the light of these, and similar figures, there is an obvious need for some hard and positive thinking on the part of church people. This Mr. Hodgkins has done. There is no doubt where his sympathies lie, but this is an honest book, full of constructive and clearly expressed ideas. The attitude of the Roman Church is fairly stated and discussed. It is unfortunate, in view of Scotland's interest in the subject that the situation north of the Border is hardly mentioned, but this is perhaps inevitable. The history and law of Scotland and England are very different in this particular connexion. Those who have a concern in this matter in any part of Great Britain or indeed in any part of the English-speaking world should not fail to see this excellent book.

JOHN R. GRAY

J. G. RIDDELL

The Croall Lectures for 1955 were delivered by Professor J. G. Riddell who held then the Chair of Divinity at the University of Glasgow. Failing health prevented him from preparing them for publication, and shortly before his death (in September 1955) he entrusted the task to his colleague Dr. John Macquarrie who has now made them available under the title *The Calling of God* (St. Andrew Press; 21s. net).

The six lectures have a bountiful range and they are linked together by a threefold concern. In the first place the Scottish tradition is studied in relation to the explicit standpoint of the Westminster Confession of Faith regarding the Divine Calling, especially the tensions created for thought and experience by the severance in it (the 'intolerable' severance the author says) between the *ordo decretorum* and the *ordo salutis*. This is the theme of the first lecture, though it also penetrates into much of the later discussions. It is of great value and one wishes Professor Riddell had pursued it much further.

The insistence of these lectures is that 'all our thought about the calling of God should centre in Jesus Christ', so in the second place Professor Riddell inquires into the meaning and adequacy of the forms with which theology has spoken of and for the gospel—the themes of Atonement, Incarnation, Holy Spirit, The Church (Word and

Sacrament) fill the four matterful chapters that follow in that order. In this theological errand Professor Riddell is wide and generous in his interests and appreciations, but always what we might call cool and cautious. As Principal Mauchline says in the Introductory Memoir, 'he was neither neo-Calvinist nor Lutheran, neither of the Existentialists nor of the Sacramentalists'. What the forms point to always is the action of God in the personal order, and this action is given to us in the totality of the events which constituted the life of Jesus—events for the understanding of which the gospel records are indispensable. The theological concerns of Professor Riddell were never separated from his pastoral instinct. This is the third feature, perhaps one should say the dominating feature in the lectures. It is light upon and help for the evangelistic task that exegesis and theology should provide. How, he would say, can this form of thought, or that expression in formulated statement, serve the ends of preaching, so that in the life of the hearer and within the corporate activity of the witnessing Church there is encounter with the saving God who acted for all and once for all in Jesus? For many readers, and very specially for his old students this will be the most appealing part in the manifold material described and sifted here. One name that appears often in this book is that of Macleod Campbell and it would be fair to say that much in Professor Riddell's thought and evaluation derives from that source in our Scottish tradition.

The gracious and discerning Memoir which Principal Mauchline of Trinity College has provided enriches this last legacy of a great servant of the Church.

J. MACLEOD

ST. PAUL: A JEWISH ASSESSMENT

Professor H. J. Schoeps, the author of this latest and very important study of St. Paul—*Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (Lutterworth; 42s. net)—is Professor of the History of Religion at Erlangen and a Jewish scholar of international reputation. His approach to his subject is that of 'an impartial historian of religion, and one who also wishes to do justice to the Judaism from which Paul sprang'. A first draft of the book, prepared twenty years ago, has been completely re-written in the light of its author's subsequent studies of Ebionism.

It is the combination of these three factors, the impartiality of the historian, the insights of a professing Jew, and a specialist knowledge of a Judaeo-Christian sect which flourished in Palestine during the early centuries of the Christian era,

that gives special significance to this study of one whose true greatness, Professor Schoeps maintains, 'is shown in the fact that he has found no congenial interpreter and probably never will'.

From an introductory survey of the present position of Pauline research, the author goes on to examine in successive chapters St. Paul's eschatology, his soteriology, his teaching about the Law (in which Professor Schoeps sees a fundamental misapprehension due to the fact that as a 'Diaspora Pharisee and a Septuagint Jew' Paul had reduced the Law to a matter of ethical principle only, and had lost 'the sense of the covenant relationship which would have made it a living and personal possession') and, finally, his understanding of the saving purpose of God in history. A concluding chapter offers a fascinating assessment not only of the influence of Paul on subsequent Christian history, but also of the rôle he might have filled in the history of Judaism had he remained within it.

It is particularly interesting in this connexion to find Professor Schoeps advancing the thesis that there are 'two world covenants, those of Sinai and Golgotha, one for Israel and one for the nations of the world; both equally valid, but separate in the mind of God who turned to Israel on Sinai, and to the nations on Golgotha', a thesis recently propounded in almost identical terms by Dr. James Parkes in his 'Foundations of Judaism and Christianity'. Though this is unlikely in its present form to win general acceptance, it has implications which the Christian cannot ignore. Moreover, the marshalling of the evidence from which it derives is of such importance that no serious student of St. Paul can afford not to read this book, which, like all real history, is surprisingly contemporary.

W. W. SIMPSON

GNOSTICISM

Professor R. M. Grant has added yet another to the services he has already rendered, by the publication of *Gnosticism: An Anthology* (Collins; 25s. net). In the past the study of Gnosticism has not been rendered any easier by the fact that the student has had to range widely to find the sources, some in the Greek or Latin of the Fathers (and not always readily available in translation), some only in German versions of texts in other tongues. Now in this volume we have a comprehensive selection of the most important material: extracts from Irenaeus and Hippolytus, from Origen and from the Corpus Hermeticum; two documents from the Berlin Coptic Codex; the Gospel of Truth in a translation by W. W. Isenberg; the Hymn of the Pearl. Nor has the editor been

content to compile; he has added judicious introductions giving references to the literature relating to the different texts, a glossary of Gnostic terms, a bibliography and a more than useful index. It is safe to say that even those endowed with the gift of tongues will be glad to have this book at hand. Few are so proficient as to be able to 'skim' in Latin, Greek or Coptic!

Anthologies of course are exposed to criticism—an editor can often compile another volume from the suggestions of his critics—but this one is remarkably complete. Occasionally one might prefer a different rendering, but this is the case with nearly all translations; and in doubt one ought to consult the original.

The discovery at Nag Hamadi and the publication of the Gospel of Truth and the Gospel of Thomas have stimulated a new interest in this somewhat neglected field. This book presents the essential texts in convenient form, and should be warmly welcomed.

R. McL. WILSON

FAITH

A remarkable, and in some sense a symptomatic, study of the meaning and significance of faith has been made by Fr. Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C., in *Faith in the Synoptic Gospels: A Problem in the Correlation of Scripture and Theology* (University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana; \$4.00). The work is full, detailed, and scholarly, and it illustrates the increasing attention which is being given by Roman Catholic scholars to Biblical theology. Part I. examines the relevant Synoptic Texts, thirty-seven in all, and Part II. discusses the Synoptic Conception of Faith. An Epilogue follows on the Synoptic and Scholastic Conceptions of Faith, and detailed Notes and Appendices, together with a Bibliography and Indices. Father O'Connor begins by reminding us that when Martin Luther denounced the scholastic expositions of faith, he set off a controversy that has never fully quieted since, but that to-day a more systematic and better informed Biblical theology is possible. In his discussion he shows that the scholastics conceive of faith purely as belief, as assent to the truths which God has revealed, whereas the Evangelists see this faith as fulfilled in, and impregnated with, a spirit of trust. At the same time the Synoptics do not altogether disregard the dependence of faith on divine revelation. The differences do not imply that scholasticism has distorted the Scriptural notion of faith. 'On the contrary, they are due to the very effort of scholasticism to transcend all that pertains to a merely personal and arbitrary

point of view, and to conquer some of the deficiencies of ordinary, uncultivated human knowledge.' This well-balanced study is to be welcomed and read by scholars of all schools, Protestant and Catholic alike.

VINCENT TAYLOR

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY

With the increasing co-operation of such well known mental hospitals as the Crichton Royal in Dumfries and the Retreat in York in the training of ministers in pastoral care of the mentally sick (the latter has just advertised a new course for ministers beginning in October) these three small books become really relevant. The first one especially—*Pastoral Care and Clinical Training in America*, by Dr. H. Faber, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church—could be of real use to those who organize these lectures as well as to ministers interested in pastoral care. It is published by Van Loghum Slaterus of Arnhem at F. 3.90 ingen. It is the report of a three-month investigation into the pastoral and clinical training of students for the ministry. He gives the standards for pastoral training as demanded by the National Conference on training, as well as a list of the journals and magazines which specialize in this special branch of the ministry. He was welcomed by both psychiatrists and theological professors, underwent an internship in a mental hospital, and, indeed, saw everything there was to be seen of this aspect of theological training. He is full of admiration of all that he saw and learned. Yet he has his criticisms or shall we say his fears? Like many others he wonders whether there is a blurring of the distinction between pastoral counselling and therapeutic counselling. In other words between pastoral theology and pastoral psychology. These are two distinct disciplines. He also contrasts the pastoral outlook of European teachers and ministers with the American, and outlines the problems common to both. I know no better or comprehensive outline of American colleges' dynamic training in this field. It is a mine of information, and insightful comment.

His fears are well brought out in Erastus Evans' little volume—*Pastoral Care in a Changing World* (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net). This writer is familiar with all that Depth Psychology has contributed to our understanding of human nature and the psychological, moral and spiritual conflicts to which modern man is subjected. But he believes that 'the pastor is involved in the human encounter by an interest which transcends' the psychiatrist's. In other words, when the Depth Psychologist has laid bare the inner conflicts the gospel must then come in. The pastor does not

like to think that the psychologist produces insights about the human soul which traditional authority failed to find for itself. Nor does the psychiatrist like to feel that religion has the last word in dissipating guilt-feelings. He argues both sides well; but he is afraid, as Dr. Faber is, that ministers fascinated by the psychiatrist's insights and methods will think that he has just to apply psychological principles to be a successful pastor. If anything, the volume is too polemical, but there is the same call as in Dr. Faber's for more co-operation between psychology and the minister.

My final booklet is by one who is both a Professor of Psychiatry and Professor of Religion in Union Theological Seminary, New York. It deals not merely with the conflicts but with the self who is the victim of the anxiety, the conflicts and the guilt. His title is *The Self in Pilgrimage*, the author is Professor Earl A. Loomis, M.D. (S.C.M.; 6s. net). He carries on the good work of understanding from a deeper and wider level. His emphasis is upon the Self. As Reinhold Niebuhr in a Foreword puts it: 'He has dealt in a new way with the religious dimensions of selfhood. . . . In all these studies he has drawn on both the significant psychiatric and theological elaborations of basic problems of the self, of its individuality, of its need for community, and its need for forgiveness.' It is this which makes it so relevant to Pastoral Counselling and to preaching. The titles of his chapters are sufficiently informative for both preacher and counsellor to tempt one to buy the booklet. Here they are: 'The Self in Irons', 'The Self in History', 'The Self in Development', 'The Self in Community', 'The Self in Communication', 'The Self in Hell', and, finally, 'The Self in Communion'. Each chapter is well informed, and the thought is aptly illustrated.

J. G. MCKENZIE

We welcome two paper-backs in the 'Wyvern Books' series of the Epworth Press. The first is William Law's *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. This is attractively produced and is wonderfully cheap for its size (3s. 6d. net).

The second paper-back in this series is Dr. A. M. Chirgwin's *The Bible in World Evangelism*. This is its fifth printing and it is very timely that it should be reprinted in the year of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the publication of the A.V. and in the year of the publication of the N.E.B. (*New Testament*). It was first published in 1954 and reviewed at length in our July issue of that year. In its present form it should have a wide circulation. The subject is divided into two parts and part two—Using the Bible in Evangelism Today—is full of accounts of

thrilling achievements through the distribution of the Bible by colporteurs, especially in South America. The price of Dr. Chirgwin's book is also 3s. 6d.

The Spirit of Life or Life More Abundant (Hodder and Stoughton; 4s. 6d. net) is a book on the Holy Spirit by Mr. Tom Rees, with an appreciative Foreword by the Rev. John R. W. Stott, M.A. The name of the author is enough indication as to what this volume is like. Our own opinion is that it will convince none but the already convinced. It is not really so much a study of the Holy Spirit in the Bible as it is a use of the passages on the Holy Spirit to underline the author's own preconceived ideas. If anyone wishes to see what preconceived ideas can do to the interpretation of Scripture let him read the treatment of Ac 8 and the coming of the Spirit to Samaria in this book. Those who like Mr. Rees' methods will like this book. Those who do not agree with them will remain unconvinced.

Studies in Josephus, by the Rev. R. J. H. Shutt, M.A. Ph.D. (S.P.C.K.; 22s. 6d. net), is a scholarly and important study. It is a critical examination of Josephus the man and his writings, especially with regard to the main points of controversy which have arisen. Dr. Shutt admits the inconsistencies in Josephus's own account of his mission to Galilee in the time of the Jewish revolt in the first century A.D. and how easily his subsequent associations with the Romans and his favourable treatment by them provoked the hostility of his fellow-Jews. He believes that Josephus was proud and ambitious as a man, and, in consequence, sometimes unscrupulous when his own personal interests were concerned; and these qualities sometimes obtruded into his writings. Yet Dr. Shutt will not call Josephus an untrustworthy historian; he aimed at accuracy; he wrote in good faith, even if he made mistakes in detail. The fact that, later in life, he was an apologist for Judaism possibly can be interpreted as showing how his ambitions and his inner loyalties were held in unreconciled tension.

In a new series called 'Theological Collections' the S.P.C.K. has just published a small book (of ninety-three pages) under the title of *The Communication of the Gospel in New Testament Times* (8s. 6d. net). It is a title to attract attention and awaken interest, but unhappily it must be said that the title does not really describe the contents. These consist of six independently produced lectures by six distinguished scholars (Austin Farrer, C. F. Evans, J. A. Emerton, F. W. Beare, R. A. Markus, and F. W. Dillistone). They are

not a symposium prepared around an agreed theme, but individual lectures delivered on quite separate occasions, when the speakers were free to choose as their subject what was 'at the top of their minds'. Readers, therefore, may be disappointed who buy the book on the recommendation of its title. Those will most be attracted to it who specially want to read the work of one or more of the named contributors. Many, however, will find special interest in F. W. Beare's note of defiance to current fashion. He affirms that Hellenistic influences have affected the writers of the New Testament far more than it is the current orthodoxy among Biblical scholars to allow, and what is more, the New Testament is not the worse for this, but much the better.

An S.C.M. paper-back which can be recommended to every reader is *The British Churches Today*, by the Rev. Kenneth Slack. While the history of these churches has a minor place, the stress is definitely on to-day. The author gives not only the facts but also the nuances. For example—if English people have been startled by the storm and fury to which "the Bishops' Report" (i.e. the Report on Anglican-Presbyterian conversations published in April 1957) gave rise in Scotland, in Scotland they have been appalled at the indifference of the English churchman to so remarkable a document'. There is excellent value in this book for 5s. net. We wish it many readers.

We welcome a new S.C.M. paper-back issued at 5s. net.—*St. Paul and the Gospel of Jesus*, by Canon Charles E. Raven. His answer to the question implicit in the title is that the resemblance between the Jesus of the Gospels and the Jesus Christ of St. Paul, both in character and events, is too significantly strong to be accidental, and that in St. Paul we have the clearest and best documented of all the records of the impact which Jesus made on His contemporaries. This is not, however, a purely academic study of Epistles in relation to Gospels. The point of view is indicated by the sub-title, 'A Study of the Basis of Christian Ethics', and all along the author, scientist as well as theologian, has his eye upon the spiritual crisis of modern man and the relevance to it of the Christian revelation.

In the June 1960 number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 285) Professor Rowley reviewed the French edition of Dr. Barth's study of *Anselm: Fides Quaerens Intellectum*. This careful study by Barth of the thought of Anselm can now be read in English. The S.C.M. have published an edition of it in their 'Library of Philosophy and Theology' (25s. net).

Agreements Between Matthew and Luke

BY THE REVEREND A. W. ARGYLE, M.A., B.D., OXFORD

In discussions of the Synoptic Problem it has usually been assumed that the agreements between Matthew and Luke fall into three classes :

A. Agreements due to the fact that both Matthew and Luke used Mark.

B. Agreements in the non-Markan matter common to Matthew and Luke.

C. Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark.

Insufficient attention has been given to a fourth class :

D. Narrative or editorial agreements between Matthew and Luke which cannot be explained either by their common use of Mark or by their common use of a source other than Mark.

The first class does not call for any further explanation. We will examine the remaining classes in the reverse order, and begin with the fourth class.

(1) At Mt 5¹⁻² we read : ' Seeing the multitudes, he went up into the mountain : and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him : and he opened his mouth and taught them '. The implication of these words is that the Sermon on the Mount was addressed by Jesus to His disciples. (Up to date there were only four of them.) At the close of the Sermon, however, we read : ' And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these words, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching ; for he taught them as having authority, and not as their scribes ' (7²⁸⁻²⁹). This conclusion is clearly taken from Mk 1²², where we learn that the congregation in the synagogue at Capernaum ' were astonished at his teaching ; for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes '. Matthew has here returned to his Marcan source, either not noticing that he has created a discrepancy in his own narrative or intending to imply that the multitudes had gathered round the disciples in the course of the Sermon.

Now let us compare Lk 6²⁰ : ' And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said ' : the Sermon which follows is thus explicitly stated to have been addressed to the disciples. (In Luke they are already twelve.) At the conclusion of the Sermon (7¹) we read ' After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the people, he entered into Capernaum '. As in Matthew, so in Luke, the Sermon which began by being addressed to the disciples

ends by being addressed to the crowd. In Matthew's case this is explicable by his use of Mk 1²². But this explanation will not serve in the case of Luke, for he has already used Mk 1²² at 4³². This agreement of Luke with Matthew must be explained either as a mere coincidence or by the hypothesis that Luke was acquainted with Matthew's Gospel.

In Luke the Sermon is followed at once by a visit to Capernaum and the healing of the centurion's servant. This is the sequence also in the non-Markan material of Matthew. Matthew 8¹⁻⁴ concerns the healing of the leper, and is based upon Mk 1⁴⁰⁻⁴⁵, a section which Luke has already used in 5¹²⁻¹⁶. Immediately following the healing of the leper, we have in Matthew the visit to Capernaum and the healing of the centurion's servant or son (*παῖς* [Mt 8^{6. 8}]). Thus both Matthew and Luke place this episode at Capernaum immediately after the Sermon, as far as the non-Markan material is concerned. This agreement of Luke with Matthew must be explained either by the hypothesis that they used a common source which possessed this narrative framework, or by the hypothesis that Luke was acquainted with Matthew's Gospel.

The upholders of the Q hypothesis of course adopt the former alternative. B. H. Streeter's reconstruction of Q starts with six items, the preaching of John the Baptist, the Baptism of Jesus, the Temptation, the Great Sermon, the Centurion's Servant, and the Message of John the Baptist to Jesus, which occurs somewhat later in Matthew. ' The motive for the postponement ', he says,¹ ' is obvious. Jesus refers John's disciples to the evidence afforded by certain miracles (Mt 11⁵). Matthew postpones the incident until he has had time to give an example, taken from Mark, of each of the miracles mentioned. Luke solves the same problem in another way ; by inserting (7²¹) a statement, " In that hour he healed many, etc." '

So far, then, the hypothetical Q, though described as mainly a ' sayings-source ', has a solid narrative framework. But after this point narrative seems to peter out, and there is a mere collection of sayings. Both Matthew and Luke concur in the relative order in which they introduce ' Foxes have holes ', ' The harvest is plenteous ', and the Mission Charge. The narrative framework

¹ *The Four Gospels* [1930], 273.

for this last differs in Matthew and Luke: in the latter it appears as part of a Mission Charge to the Seventy, in Matthew as part of a Mission Charge to the Twelve. Much of the remaining Q material Matthew works into his great blocks of discourse. What, then, became of the narrative sequence so promisingly begun? It is difficult to visualize such a document. One would have thought that a narrative so begun must continue to its conclusion. It is difficult to imagine a *via media* between a Gospel on the one hand and a mere collection of sayings on the other. Yet it seems that Q, if it existed, was neither the one nor the other.

(2) We turn now to the third class: agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. Streeter's examination of these was by no means exhaustive. The full list was given by E. A. Abbott in the Appendix of his book *The Corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke* [1901]. Streeter explains these alleged agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark as due to various causes: (a) independent stylistic alterations; (b) the influence of Q, where Q and Mark are supposed to overlap; (c) corruption of the manuscripts arising from assimilation of parallels as between Matthew and Luke or minute errors in the text of Mark.

(a) Many of these (like the substitution by Matthew and Luke of *εἰπεν* for Mark's *λέγει*) are certainly unimportant. But there are others which, as Streeter himself admits, are more striking.

Mk 2 ¹²	Mt 9 ⁷
ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων	ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ
Lk 5 ²⁶	
ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ	

Streeter holds that Matthew and Luke have independently made this alteration to bring the action of the healed man into line with the Lord's command 'Arise, take up thy bed, and go to thy house'. But is this explanation completely convincing? The substitution, though natural, is by no means necessary. Moreover the substituted words in Matthew and Luke need not have occurred in the same order. Luke could equally well have written *εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν*, just as in 8³¹ he has written *εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσον ἀπελθεῖν*.

Mk 16 ⁸	Mt 28 ⁸
οὐδὲνὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἔφοβοῦντο γάρ	μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγ- γεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
Lk 24 ⁹	
ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἐνδεκα- καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς	

Streeter's argument that both Matthew and Luke independently took Mark's words 'They told no man anything' to mean 'they did not spread the news abroad', not 'they did not deliver the message of the angel' is far from convincing. That either of them should have inferred from Mark's words that the women reported the matter to the disciples is surprising enough. That they should both have done so *independently* is incredible. Even if we concede Streeter's argument on this point, *ἀπαγγέλλειν* is not the only word that could be used to express the giving of the message. Luke could, for instance, have used *ἀναγγέλλειν*, as he does in Ac 14²⁷ 15⁴ 19¹⁸ 20²⁰. 27.

A striking agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark which Streeter does not discuss occurs at Mt 8²⁷, Lk 8²⁵.

Mk 4 ¹	Mt 8 ²⁷
καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν	οἵ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν

Lk 8 ²⁵
φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν

Did Matthew and Luke *independently* decide to use a verb of amazement here? And did they *independently* decide to use *θαυμάζω*, not *ἐκπλήσσομαι*, and the aorist tense, not the imperfect?

Another instance which Streeter omits to consider is Mk 9¹⁸ (*ἴσχυσαν*), Mt 17¹⁶, Lk 9¹⁰ (*οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν*). W reads *ἡδυνήθησαν* in Mark, but this is almost certainly an instance of assimilation to the other Gospels, a factor to which Streeter himself frequently refers.

(b) The explanation of agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark by the hypothesis that Mark and Q overlapped will obviously convince only those who are already persuaded that the Q hypothesis is sound. As an argument for the Q hypothesis, which is the point at issue, it involves the fallacy of *petitio principii*.

(c) The question of textual corruption is a difficult one, and only the experts in textual criticism, of whom the present writer does not claim to be one, are competent to pronounce authoritatively upon it. But to a non-expert some of Streeter's arguments under this head seem far from convincing.

Mk 2 ²²	Mt 9 ⁷
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται	ὁ οἶνος ἐκχείται καὶ
καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί	οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολλύνται
Lk 5 ³⁷	
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται	

Streeter rejects *ἐκχείται* in Matthew, because it is absent in Dak, a 'Western non-interpolation'. Throughout his textual review Streeter regards the evidence of a 'Western non-interpolation' as

decisive, not needing further argument. Is the matter really as simple as that? The New English Bible translation accepts *έκχειται* in Matthew as the true reading, thus upholding an important agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark.

Mk 14 ⁶⁵	Mt 26 ⁶⁸
προφήτευσον	προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, χριστέ, τίς ἔστιν ὁ παῖς σας σε
Lk 22 ⁶⁴	
προφήτευσον, τίς ἔστιν ὁ παῖς σας σε	

The words *χριστέ, τίς ἔστιν ὁ παῖς σας σε*; occur in Mark also in W Θ 13 etc., 579, 700. The addition is probably due to assimilation. The text of the New English Bible translation reads *προφήτευσον* alone, merely commenting in a footnote 'Some witnesses add Who hit you? as in Matthew and Luke'. The decision not to add these words in the text means that authoritative opinion on textual criticism to-day upholds this very striking and major agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark. Streeter would avoid this awkward conclusion by omitting the additional words in Matthew,¹ but the New English Bible translation does not uphold this theory.

(3) Finally, we turn to the agreements in the non-Markan matter common to Matthew and Luke. Of these there are three possible explanations: (a) use of Luke by Matthew; (b) use of Matthew by Luke; (c) use by Matthew and Luke of a common source.

The instance which we examined in (1), Mt 5¹⁻² 7²⁸⁻²⁹, Lk 6²⁰ 7¹, has shown that if either evangelist used the other, it was Luke who used Matthew. The choice therefore rests between (b) and (c).

Streeter rejects (b), arguing 'If Luke derived this material from Matthew, he must have gone through both Matthew and Mark so as to discriminate with meticulous precision between Marcan and non-Marcan material; he must then have proceeded with the utmost care to tear every little piece of non-Marcan material he desired to use from the context of Mark in which it appeared in Matthew—in spite of the fact that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate—in order to re-insert it into a different context of Mark having no special appropriateness. A theory which would make an author capable of such a proceeding would only be tenable if, on other grounds, we had reason to believe that he was a crank.'

It is certainly an exaggeration to say that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate. Are the sayings in Mt 10²⁸⁻³⁹ appropriately placed in the Mission Charge to

the Twelve (Mk 6⁸⁻¹¹)? Clearly not. Luke would be perfectly justified in taking them from the Marcan context in which he found them in Matthew, and distributing them in more suitable contexts in his own Gospel: 12²⁻⁹, 51-53 14²⁶⁻²⁷ 17³³. This is not the work of a crank, but of a discerning critic.

Again, Mt 8¹⁸⁻²² follows very awkwardly on 8¹⁶⁻¹⁷ (=Mk 1³²⁻³⁴). In 8¹⁶ it is late evening, as in Mk 1³². The incident of healing in Mark is followed by a period of night and the dawn of a new day, as one would expect. But Matthew, apparently forgetting that he has taken from Mark the fact that it was late evening, proceeds: 'Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart to the other side'. Then follows the section 'Two Claimants to Discipleship' which occurs also in Lk 9⁵⁷⁻⁶⁰, in a context where Matthew's discrepancy is avoided.

Moreover, it is not true to say that Luke always places his Q material in a different context from that found in Matthew. For instance, Matthew (13³³) and Luke (13²⁰) both place the parable of the Leaven immediately after the parable of the Mustard Seed, taken from Mk 4³⁰⁻³².

Streeter's argument therefore is based on an inaccurate description and evaluation of the evidence and is accordingly unjust to the hypothesis that Luke used Matthew, an hypothesis that has never been disproved.

Streeter's own choice is, of course, (c): the Q hypothesis. Unfortunately further hypotheses have had to be invented for its support. Whereas in some Q passages³ the agreement in wording between Matthew and Luke is extremely close, in others it is far from close. In the latter kind, differences have been explained as variant translations of Aramaic. But this further hypothesis introduces confusion: it raises doubt whether Q could have been a single document. In some sections the extent of verbal agreement is so great that Matthew and Luke must *ex hypothesi* have been following the same Greek document, whether or not this was a translation of Aramaic. But if Q was a single Greek document, then we must rule out the possibility of translation variants. What the hypothesis of translation variants really postulates is something like Bussmann's⁴ theory of two Q's, one which he calls T, which consists of passages showing close agreement and derived from the same Greek document, the other called R, consisting of passages showing considerable variation, in which Matthew and Luke used

³ E.g., John's call to repentance, On serving two masters, The foxes have holes, The great thanksgiving, The lament over Jerusalem, etc.

⁴ *Synoptischen Studien* [1925], ii.

or made separate Greek versions of an Aramaic original.

In addition to the weakness involved in adding complicated hypotheses to bolster up a tottering hypothesis, we have to note the disagreement among Aramaic scholars concerning the translation variants. A notable instance which Dr. Matthew Black says 'has survived criticism'¹ concerns Mt 23²⁶, Lk 11⁴¹ where Wellhausen² conjectured that τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην is a mistranslation of Aramaic, Luke or his source having misread δְּכִי (dakki) 'cleanse' as זְכִי (zakki) 'give alms'. But even this is disputed by Aramaic scholars;³ and T. W. Manson does not assign

¹ *An Aramaic Approach to Gospels and Acts* [1954], 2.

² *Einl.*, 27. ³ See C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* [1953], 186.

this passage to Q with any confidence, though Streeter does. Could confusion be worse confounded?

The present writer has for many years defended the Q hypothesis, but with increasing uneasiness and uncertainty. A recent re-reading of Streeter's *The Four Gospels* left the impression that his discussion on this issue was prejudiced from the outset, and that his arguments were vitiated by occasional exaggeration and inaccuracy. In particular, the repeated appeal to coincidence in the examination of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark seemed to betray a weakness in his case. Moreover the evidence we have examined in (1) does not appear to have been considered at all.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Gentle Giant

By H. F. MATHEWS, M.A., B.D., PH.D.,
KIDDERMINSTER

'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.'—Mt 5⁶.

'CALL in the Gentle Giant', said the advertisement. Who was he, I wondered, and what could he do for me? The Gentle Giant, it seemed, was a great removal firm. Their experts can shift a houseful of furniture, or a huge new dynamo, or a massive boiler, or a tank or two as easily as kiss your hand! The Gentle Giant has machinery, a fleet of lorries, men who know how to take the strain and cut out the sweat and tears. That's fine. No need to tear your muscles to pieces, or worry how it will all work out. Call in the Gentle Giant. With his internal combustion engines, he will do it all!

The Gentle Giant. The more I thought about it, the less the phrase seemed to have to do with removals. First, there came to my mind Jan Struther's poem which has found its place in some junior hymn-books. Is it in yours?

When a knight won his spurs, in the stories of old,
He was *gentile* and brave, he was gallant and bold.

They were not swashbuckling thugs, those Sir Galahads and Sir Grawains. They could be incredibly brave; but the words we most frequently associate with them are 'gentleness' and 'courtesy'. And somehow in our un-knightly age we have forgotten a good deal of that sort of virtue. Our modern equivalent of a knights' jousting match seems to be an all-in-wrestling

bout. But Lam 'em Larry of Little Lodden won't last so long in men's memories as Sir Lancelot.

The Gentle Giant. Second, I found myself thinking of Christopher, the strong man who wanted to serve the strongest power on earth. He found his Hero, not in the potent warrior or the mighty king, but in the Christ who reigned from His Cross. And Christopher used his great strength to carry pilgrims across the flood river.

The Gentle Giant. But third, I remembered the story of a very ancient book which is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It was bought very cheaply, for it had been drenched when it fell into a river and was carried down-stream; and the rich golden covers it once had were stolen in the sixteenth century. It is a copy of the Four Gospels which was the property of Queen Margaret of Scotland who died in 1251. Her husband, Malcolm III, was a rough, war-like lord. Wherever he marched, fear spread through the land. No one knew how much blood would be shed when Malcolm was about.

But his Queen was soft and gentle and good and kind; and somehow she had such an influence on her rough husband that he mellowed and became gracious too. He was never able to read the precious books which she cherished. But he employed the finest craftsmen he could find to bind those books and to have them richly ornamented, so that they should be treasures indeed, and so that his gentle Queen should know how very much he honoured her. Yes, a very gentle giant. The book in the Library is one he gave her.

We could do with many more Gentle Giants in our generation. We have plenty of Strong Men who can blast rocks to make new highways,

and who can force through legislation which will separate people of one colour from those of another, though they share the same country, and who can start revolutions among quiet native peoples. The Gentle Giants are those who are moved by a mighty Power which possesses them—it is the power of the Spirit of God.

This word of Jesus which we have taken as our text is not a popular slogan in 1961. The advertisement did not suggest that we should call in the 'meek'. But that is because we have forgotten the true meaning of the word. It would have been almost a proper translation into modern English if the New English Bible had said: 'How blest are the gentle giants; they shall have the earth for their possession'.

Do you use Charles Kingsley's great prayer at school?

Take from us, O God,
All pride and vanity,
All boasting and forwardness.
And give us the true courage that shows itself by gentleness;
The true wisdom that shows itself by simplicity;
And the true power that shows itself by modesty;
Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

All Aboard

BY THE REVEREND JAMES WRIGHT, D.D.,
THORNHILL, DUMFRIESSHIRE

Most of you, I am sure, know the song *The Bonnie Bonnie Banks o' Loch Lomond*, and many of you will have seen these bonnie banks, and some, no doubt, will have enjoyed a sail on the loch itself, for there are boats on it which take trippers for a cruise. Years ago, a new boat was built for this purpose in a shipyard at nearby Dumbarton. When it was finished, it had to travel a few miles up the River Leven which runs down from this loch to the Firth of Clyde. All went well until a point was reached where the ship had to pass under a bridge. The eye of the Captain detected that the mast of the ship was too tall to clear the bridge and would be smashed if he sailed on. What could he do about it? Well, the children of the neighbourhood had gathered in a crowd to see the new ship pass. The Captain had the ship drawn in to the bank and the gangway pushed out, with one end resting on the ship and the other on the shore. He then called out to the youngsters to come aboard and have a trip up to the loch. They needed no second invitation. They swarmed on to the ship—more than two hundred of them. Have you guessed what happened then? The weight of all these children pressed the boat

lower in the water so that the mast could now clear the bridge. And so the ship with the boys and girls aboard sailed on to Loch Lomond.

Well, it is just like that with the ship we call 'The Church'. It will go forward and be sure to continue its voyage into the future if you children are in the ship. That is one reason why we are so eager that you should come to Sunday School and to church and learn to know your Bible and to love and serve our Lord Jesus Christ. That is tremendously important, as I hope you see.

But the children's coming aboard meant not only that the boat was able to continue on its way to the loch, it meant a happy trip for the boys and girls who were on it. What a thrill it must have been for them to sail up the river and on to the lovely waters of the loch; and I can promise you that if you will listen to the voice of Jesus calling you to travel through life under His command, and accept His invitation, you will never regret it. That, and that alone, will make your journey worth while and satisfying and bring you at its end to an even lovelier place than the 'Bonnie, Bonnie Banks o' Loch Lomond'.

The Christian Year

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Unclaimed Riches

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MARTIN, B.D.,
GLASGOW

'Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive.'—Jn 16²⁴.

The first attempt to construct the Panama Canal ended in catastrophic failure. It was a French enterprise, with the engineer, De Lesseps, at its head. Much money was expended, masses of machinery were employed, and thousands of lives were lost; and, at the finish, the project was abandoned in despair while still far from complete. Had anyone occasion later to contemplate this unfinished work, what must he have thought? As he remembered all that had gone into it of human toil and human ingenuity and human sacrifice, and as he saw it now settling down into the mud, an ugly, useless wreck, might he not have said to himself, 'Was it only for this that so great a price was paid?'

And as God looks down upon our lives, yours and mine, poor, unlovely things in so many ways and empty of so much of that grace with which He is anxious to have them filled, and as He thinks at the same time of Calvary, might He not say, 'Was it only for this that so great a price was paid?'

It is a plain, though tragic, fact that many of us are allowing the riches of Christ's gospel to remain, for the most part, unclaimed and unused. Yet they are there, there for us and there for the taking. Why is it that we lay hold on so few of them? The reason can only be one of two things. Either we do not really believe that these riches may be ours or we are quite content without them. Either we lack faith or we lack ambition.

Often the trouble is lack of faith. This blasé world of ours would see a great many more miracles than it does if only we Christians were men and women of greater faith. But we do not really believe our faith. We do not expect God to work miracles in our day; and certainly we have no expectancy that He will accomplish in us those wonderful things of which His gospel speaks. As a result He very rarely can.

Just as often the trouble is lack of ambition. We are quite content with what Jesus Christ has already done for us and have no real desire that He should do anything more. It is enough for us that we have crossed the border into His Kingdom of life. We have no yearning to explore it further and to possess it more fully.

This is how it is with many of us with regard to the riches of the gospel. And yet, if only we had real faith and real ambition concerning them, the promises would work themselves out in our experience too.

We could become, for instance, creatures of new moral power. Jesus' claim is that, given the opportunity, He can make us into new men and women. Given full willingness on our part, He will change us radically.

One of the best known incidents in the whole realm of the Old Testament writings is that where the Lord tells Jeremiah to go and see the potter at work. Jeremiah obeys the command and, as he looks on at the potter fashioning a vessel of clay, the craftsman's hand slips and the vessel is disfigured. But the potter does not throw the spoiled vessel on to the rubbish heap. Instead he makes it afresh.

And if we would give our lives with full faith and real ambition into the hands of the Lord Jesus Christ, He could make them afresh for us.

We could become, too, creatures of new joy. Jesus declares that in wholehearted allegiance to Him there is to be found joy that is full and running over. I am come 'that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full' is one of the ways in which He expresses it. An old preacher once expressed it like this. 'Joy! J-O-Y. J for Jesus, Y for You, and you get Joy when there is Jesus and there is You and there is nothing in between.' Quaintly as it may be put, this is indeed the secret of joy, real joy—close fellowship with Jesus.

We could become, also, creatures of a new invincibility. If we really believed that Jesus could make us more than conquerors and if we really wanted Him to do it, there is no doubt at all that He would. Defeat can be our lot only through our own refusal to accept the victory offered us. If we allow the grace of Jesus Christ to garrison us we must and we shall come triumphant through even the darkest and most fearsome experience.

Much as people go to-day to see Salvador Dali's 'Christ', people of another generation used to go to see a painting which showed Jesus hanging on the Cross and enshrouded in thick darkness. At first this was all that could be seen and Jesus appeared to be utterly and terribly alone. But if the picture was studied more closely the arms of God could be detected amid the darkness, enfolding and supporting His suffering Son.

The arms of God the Father are always there, ready to bear us up, too, whatever the darkness that may enfold us; and they shall bear us up, making us invincible, if we will permit them.

These that have been mentioned are just some of the promises Jesus makes to the man of faith. But mention even of these few will no doubt be enough to throw into sharp relief the contrast that often exists between the shining glory of the riches promised and the drab reality of our actual experience.

How is this to be explained? Is the gospel after all simply pretty to look at and to listen to but without any relevance for real life? The riches of the gospel are there all right and they are there for us, for all of us, there for the taking, there for the asking. The real trouble is that often we do not ask or, if we ask, we ask much too little or much too half-heartedly. Yet if we would only ask, as Jesus bids us, really believing that Jesus can do what He says, and really wanting Him to do it for us, what a tremendous difference that would make. For this would be to claim at last the riches we are meant to have and which were won for us at so great a cost.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

'He Who for Men their Surety Stood'

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE B. CAIRD, D.PHIL.,
OXFORD

'How can I go back to my father if the lad is not with me?'—Gn 44³⁴ (R.S.V.).

Judah's pleading with Joseph is a superb piece of court-room technique, an example of unsophisticated advocacy which for sheer pathos has no parallel in English literature, unless it be the rustic eloquence of Jeanie Deans, pleading

with Queen Caroline for her sister's life. Observe how skilfully Judah brings forth the arguments best calculated to appeal to the nobility of the judge before whom he stands—the man's own responsibility for bringing Benjamin to Egypt, the reluctance of Jacob, overborne only by the grim pressure of famine, the fatal shock awaiting the aged patriarch, and his own offer of himself as surety for the boy's safe return.

Observe, too, the irony of the narrative. The reader knows what Judah does not know, the identity of Joseph. He knows that years earlier Judah and the others had betrayed the laws of family solidarity, which dictated that the older brother should be responsible for the younger. Irritated beyond endurance by Jacob's favouritism and Joseph's arrogance, they had got rid of him. To Jacob they had said, 'We're sorry ! We seem to have lost Joseph'; and they had absolved themselves of responsibility by producing his blood-stained coat as evidence of misadventure. Deeply suspicious, Jacob had allowed himself to be convinced by counterfeit evidence. Now by equally counterfeit evidence Joseph has arranged, with Mikado-like ingenuity, that the punishment shall fit the crime. Benjamin is to be convicted of theft, and once more the brothers must report to Jacob, 'We're sorry ! We seem to have lost Benjamin.'

In the event it is Joseph who breaks down, all his elaborate schemes jettisoned in the tide of an irresistible emotion. What overcomes his severity and reserve is the recognition that Judah is no longer the irresponsible brother of earlier days, but one who, at the cost of liberty or life, is prepared to stand surety for Benjamin.

In modern speech surety is a financial term with a coldly legal significance. It connotes an obligation with a legal sanction. But there is nothing of this in the intention of Judah. We do indeed find it in the parallel story of Reuben. For this saga of Joseph was preserved in two independent versions, a southern one with Judah, naturally, as the great-hearted hero, and a northern one in which the honours went to Reuben. In the northern story Reuben says, 'Slay my two sons if I do not bring him back to you'; there is a legal sanction built into the agreement. But in the story of Judah there is no legal consequence following upon failure. 'I shall bear the guilt before my father all my days'. He undertakes no legal bargain but a moral responsibility. He makes himself accountable for Benjamin's safety in a debt of honour far more deeply binding than any enforceable by legal process.

All this could be said of Judah without making him a really sympathetic character. He could have been acting out of pure self-regard, unwilling

to endure the stain on his honour or to face the prospect of living with his own failure and his father's recriminations. Of all the passions that corrupt the character and vitiate our relations with others none is more insidious than injured pride. This is the fountain of that self-pity which masquerades as repentance, of those hurt feelings which are the most gruesome form of spiritual blackmail. Self-indulgence is a frank and open vice, but self-concern is a hypocrite that passes itself off as virtue. Judah was moved by no such base motives, but by a genuine and affectionate understanding of his father's heart. In Jesus' story of the two sons the elder son had never left home, yet he had a littleness of heart and mind which prevented him from comprehending his father's magnanimity. Living under the same roof and eating at the same table, he was as far from his father as ever the prodigal was in the heathen piggery. Judah was prompted by a real concern for his father. In one sense he was prepared to put himself in the place of Benjamin ; in quite a different sense he had already put himself in the place of Jacob.

How much history there is in this ancient saga, I do not know ; but this I do know, that the man who wrote this magnificent tale, nameless though he be, was a historical character, and one of such breadth of human sympathy and such depth of religious insight that of him it might be said, as Paul said of Abraham, that he had the gospel preached to him in advance. Here was a man who firmly believed that God was able to take the lives of ordinary, sinful men and refashion them into something noble, through which His own glory could shine.

In recent years there has been a great resurgence of typology, the search for correspondences between the Old and New Testaments. It can be an arid science, a field for unbridled and profitless fantasy. But abuses apart, it must embody a truth about Scripture which rests on the double foundation that in the two Testaments it is the same God who deals with the same human nature. Just as an art expert can see in a painting the unmistakable indications that it is a genuine Rembrandt or Vermeer, so the divine Artist leaves on all those whom His hand has touched the recognizable traces of His handicraft. And the human nature which we see under the hand of God in all its earthiness and crude vitality in the Old Testament is the same that we see brought to its perfection in Jesus Christ. In one of the most exquisite compliments ever addressed to a lady John Donne wrote :

If ever any beauty I did see
Which I desir'd and got, 'twas but a dreame of thee.

This surely is what we want to say about the Old Testament and its relation to Christ. All its grandeur, nobility, and wonder point forward to the greater treasure that was to come.

But why, you may ask, do we need to keep the lesser glories of the Old Testament when we have the full light of the gospel? 'When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.'

You meaner beauties of the night,
That poorly satisfy our eyes,
More by your number, than your light ;
You common people of the skies,
What are you when the moon shall rise ?

My answer to that question is twofold. First, it is only in comparison with the 'meaner beauties' that we come to appreciate the full wonder of Christ. 'What language shall I borrow?', says the hymn. And we can express our faith in Christ only in language borrowed from God's dealings with lesser men. Second, Christ is so far above the realms of our own achievement that He can all too readily become unreal to us. The earliest heresy was Docetism, a denial of the real humanity of Christ. To this day in the Roman Catholic Church there are those to whom Christ is so awful and remote that He can be approached only through the intercessions of His mother. Typology is one of the ways in which the life of Christ can be kept for us firmly anchored in our common humanity.

Let us then borrow the language of our saga to see whether it will help us to do justice to Christ. As Judah stood surely for Benjamin, let us see Him standing surely for those whom He called brothers, not in any legal transaction such as mediaeval theology envisaged, but because He had chosen of His own free will to identify Himself with His fellows and to make Himself accountable for them, and because He understood the mind of His Father and was determined to obey His purpose.

I expect that at some time or other you have asked or heard others ask, How could the death of Jesus, so many years ago, affect my life in the twentieth century? If Jesus had been a solitary individual, living a life of perfection unattainable by others, this question would have no answer. But Jesus lived in a world, and you live in a world, where there is no such thing as an individual, a world in which Judah could first betray and then redeem his family responsibility, could stand surely for his brother, could enter in sympathy into the feelings of his father.

It is because we live in a world like that, and Christ shared it with us, that He can speak to you and me in the words of the Old Testament.

'I will stand surely for you. How can I go back to my Father if my brother is not with me?' He can look upon all the manifold iniquity and sorrow, pain and folly of the world, in which you and I are so deeply involved, and say, 'I will bear the guilt of it for ever'. Because of that, when Jesus surrendered His life, your life was involved with His. 'You died, and your life is hid with Christ in God.'

REMEMBRANCE SUNDAY

The Many and the One

BY THE REVEREND STUART W. MCWILLIAM, M.A.,
S.T.M., GLASGOW

'And when he had gathered all the people together, there lacked of David's servants nineteen men and Asahel.'—2 S 2³⁰.

'And it came to pass, that as many as came to the place where Asahel fell down and died stood still.'—2 S 2³³.

In the second chapter of the Second Book of Samuel we have an account of an incident in the Civil War which divided Israel after the death of Saul. At the pool of Gibeon a fierce and bloody battle was fought between the men of Ish-bosheth, Saul's son, and the men of David. Ish-bosheth's troops were commanded by Abner, while David's were commanded by his nephew Joab who had with him his brothers Abishai and Asahel, the latter still only a youth. During the fighting which took place, Asahel challenged Abner to personal combat but he was no match for this tried warrior and he was slain. And the chronicler recording the melancholy tale of the casualties of war makes this very significant statement in v. 30. 'And when Joab had gathered all the people together, there lacked of David's servants nineteen men and Asahel'. Nineteen men and Asahel! What a lot this one short sentence can say to us about the cost of war. Why is Asahel singled out for special mention?

i. *Because Asahel was someone special.* He was the young man with the brilliant future whose death in this apparently pointless engagement high-lighted for a moment the shocking, tragic wastefulness of war. With similar feelings might men of a later age have read of the death of Rupert Brooke in Gallipoli, and looking through the list of casualties one morning said, 'Nineteen men and Rupert Brooke' and mourned for the singer slain and the songs that now would never be sung since they had died with him. For is not this one of the most tragic features of war that it seems to claim the best, the bravest, the most generous, as its victims? It is inevitable that this should be so, for it is the bright, eager, adventurous,

generous spirit which responds first to the call of duty and sacrifice. This country is still suffering from the loss of the men who died in the holocaust of the 1914-1918 War, the missing generation of which we sometimes speak, the men who would have provided leaders in every realm of our national life, the Asahels.

2. Nineteen men and Asahel! Why is Asahel specially mentioned? *Because he was someone's brother!* To be precise he was Joab's brother. This was a name the chronicler knew. What a difference it makes when a name leaps out of the casualty list as the name of someone you knew and loved! And, surely, this for us is the almost unbearable poignancy of Remembrance Sunday that in silence we stand and remember 'Nineteen men and Asahel!'

The faceless millions and David, Jack, Ian, Hamish, Robert! The real cost of war only comes home when you realize that each one slain was not just a regimental number, a cypher in a column of statistics, but someone's brother, husband, father, son! I have quite often heard people talk almost complacently about the fact that the casualties suffered by Britain in the Second World War were less than those in the First World War. They have compared the numbers killed in twelve days fighting at El Alamein with the numbers killed on the first day of Vimy Ridge, the Somme or Paschendale, and by inference suggested that we have nothing to complain about, that we have, indeed, something of which we can feel quite satisfied. If your son or your husband is killed in action does it really lessen the blow to know that there were only twenty thousand others killed instead of forty thousand?

Don't misunderstand me, I am not attacking the use of statistics—that would be very foolish. I am attacking the kind of mentality, increasingly common to-day which cannot see behind the statistics to what they mean in terms of the lives of men and women. Modern warfare has become more horrible because it has become almost completely impersonal. I believe that to meet a man face to face in anger and to kill him in anger as a person is less of a sin than to destroy him from a distance as you would destroy a thing! In an American television programme a Japanese who had survived the bombing of Hiroshima was brought face to face with the American pilot of the plane which dropped the bomb. The two men were asked their reactions when the bomb fell. The Japanese said, 'I said to myself "My God what has happened to us"', and the American said 'I said to myself "My God what have we done"'. The comments might equally have been reversed and the Japanese might have said, 'My God what have we done—meaning to bring

this upon us'. And the American might well have said, 'My God what has happened to us that we have become capable of doing this'. Modern warfare has become more horrible because it has become less horrifying. We can press a button and not see what we do, not see the result.

We must see the cost of war in personal terms, in the lives of people, and I am convinced that we will not see it until we see that each victim is Asahel to God, is God's child, is a name known to God and is not just someone's brother but is, because we, too, are God's children, our brother, then and only then will the full cost of war come home to each and every one of us.

3. And, thirdly, in v. 23 the writer tells us: 'And it came to pass, that as many as came to the place where Asahel fell down and died stood still'. Is not this what Remembrance Sunday means for us. We come as it were to the place where Asahel fell down and died and we stand still. We stand still as men must always stand still in the presence of sacrifice and courage, to give thanks.

Blow out, you bugles, over the rich Dead!

There's none of these so lonely and poor of old,
But, dying, has made us rarer gifts than gold.
These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of work and joy, and that unhoped serene,
That men call age; and those who would have
been,
Their sons, they gave, their immortality.

To stand still in honour of courage and sacrifice and to give thanks, this surely is why we keep Remembrance Sunday. But is that all. Must we not again ask why they died lest we forget the reason for their sacrifice and the purpose that called forth their courage? Was it to make us rich in wordly goods? To make us comfortable? Did they really die for the Welfare State or to make the world safe for capitalism? Did they die for the kind of world in which we now live? To lay the foundation for a future war more terrible still than that which they had known? Surely not!

Blow, bugles, blow! They brought us, for our
dearth,

Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain.
Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.

But is there holiness and love? Does honour reign and nobleness walk our ways again and have we, indeed, come into our heritage? Nothing so reveals the true character of a man or of a nation

as what he or that nation does with the fruits of the sacrifices of others. As we look out upon the world, as we look in upon our own lives, can we say proudly and without shame to that great host of unseen witnesses, 'See you brothers what we have done with that which you gave us'? This is one of the most challenging and disturbing thoughts that comes on Remembrance Sunday.

We have come to the place where Asahel died that we might stand still and remember in thanksgiving the courage and the sacrifice of the nineteen men and Asahel, of the countless millions we did not know and the ones who were dear to us as life, but surely this, too, is the place for consecration to the things for which they gave their lives and that means, above all, consecration to God without whose aid we cannot achieve these things. I believe we must dedicate ourselves to God if we are not to render fruitless the sacrifice of our brethren.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

5. Judgment on the Individual

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A.,
LONDON

'The Ten Virgins.'—Mt 25¹⁻¹³.

Franz Kafka wrote two novels which contain a profound analysis of our human situation. In the first of these—*The Castle*—a man arrives one evening in a village which is dominated by a castle. He has been appointed to a Government post under the authority of the castle and has come to report himself. The rest of the story is occupied with his attempts to make contact with the castle. It is there above him, he can see it, yet in his walks, baffled by strange adventures, he never reaches it. The castle officers visit the village and there he tries to meet them, but always, just when he thinks contact will be made, they escape him. Mysterious and ambiguous messages reach him. Strange voices sound along the telephone line. Eventually he dies without any certainty that the castle is aware of his existence.

In *The Trial* a bank clerk wakes up one morning to find himself under arrest. But what is the charge? The mysterious characters who have arrested him cannot tell him. When will he be tried and where? Again they are in ignorance. Gradually his whole life becomes involved in meeting this unformulated charge, in preparing for his trial before this undiscoverable court.

The power of these novels lies in their unveiling of our deepest anxieties. Has life a meaning? Have I a place in the castle? Am I fundamentally guilty? Can my life find a place of acquittal?

It is at this deep and fundamental level of concern that the Parable of the Ten Virgins

speaks to us. In this sense it is the most mysterious of all Jesus' parables, proceeding as it does at a greater psychological depth. It is evocative of our deepest hopes and fears. Our hope of the marriage feast within the Kingdom of God. Our fear of the shut door and the everlasting night. It contains both *The Castle* and *The Trial*.

Because of this element of mysterious depth we are greatly tempted to do what Professor C. H. Dodd says we must not do, to allegorize. We try to find symbolic meanings in it. And in particular we fasten upon the oil. What does it symbolize? What did the wise girls possess which opened the Kingdom to them and which they could not share? And we go on from there to speculate on what virtue or grace Christians possess which is incommunicable and which marks them off from others? What is the key of the Kingdom?

So long as we are looking for some specific possession—a virtue or a grace—we are missing the point which is really much simpler. The difference was one of expectation. The wise girls expected the coming of the bridegroom and prepared for it. The unwise didn't really expect that he would come and were found unready.

This is what links this parable with the theme we have pursued throughout these sermons. Our theme is the Christian vision of history as dominated by the Resurrection and the end of the world. 'The Kingdom is Come.' It is established by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. It assures us of the end as D-day assures of V-day. Nations, churches and individuals live under the tension of these two events.

This in turn links this parable with many other parables of Christ, the talents, the faithless stewards, the unrighteous husbandmen. All these lived as though there could be no 'end', no final reckoning.

But 'The Ten Virgins' is distinct from these by this deeply personal emphasis. Here are girls all sharing in a common life, apparently all alike, not distinguished in the case of the wise by some special wakefulness, and yet profoundly different. Five are children of light. They carry the expectation of the Kingdom in their hearts, they have oil for their lamps. Five are the children of darkness, without expectation, upon whom the Kingdom comes without warning, and against whom the door is shut.

No other parable approaches so closely to our modern situation in our highly personalized world. Even a few generations ago it seemed right and natural to draw comparisons between Christians and others and to see Christians as superior to others. Outside Christendom 'heathen darkness'

reigned. Outside the orbit of the Church, vice and misery were the rule. To-day this black and white picture is destroyed. The greatest evils in the twentieth century have been hatched within Christendom. And we have a new awareness both of the virtues of non-Christian religion and of the rightness in many respects of anti-God societies. In this spiritual and moral relativity our sense of the saving meaning of the gospel may be lost.

The saving meaning lies in hope of the bridegroom. We live towards the end of all things in Christ. We are the children of expectation. Against us stand the children of cosmology. A generation ago Sir James Jeans was prophesying the universal ice age in which our planet would share and in which all life would perish. Now Fred Hoyle and other cosmologists prophesy a fiery end instead, and, cosmological prophecies aside, we may create our own lake of fire by scientific means. No secular life can look forward in hope.

On this more parochial, individual level, however, Jean Paul Sartre analyses our situation in *Huis Clos*. Here is the humanist existence of modern man without infinite horizons. Here is life narrowed to its span of earthly existence

and of earthly interests. Here is the short-circuiting of humanity. And we must be aware that this is the avowed aim of masses of people throughout the world to-day, and the supreme temptation for us all. To limit our lives to the seen and known. To shut ourselves in with our contemporaries. To enslave our aspirations to the service of our lusts and anxieties.

Sartre has the courage of his convictions. Fundamentally this is hell. Garcin, Inès, Estelle are in hell. Imprisoned in their conflicting desires ; chained to one another ; demanding from the other what that other cannot give ; they are in hell. '*L'enfer c'est les Autres.*' 'And the door was shut.'

Sartre, like Kafka, sees too that the fundamental problems are the problems of meaning and justification. Each has died 'at the wrong time'. Each is unable to atone. Man, imprisoned with man, cannot speak the liberating word.

The liberating word is in the mid-night cry of the parable, 'Behold, the bridegroom comes'. We look beyond history and historic evil, to Christ. We look beyond guilt and beyond self-justification to Christ. In Him is our life, our justification, our eternal hope. 'Go ye out to meet Him.'

Contributions and Comments

The New English Bible and the Translation of Hebrews xii. 17

We are so grateful for the first instalment of the New English Bible and for the long years of patient work which it represents that criticism must not be hasty. But ought not another look to be taken at He 12¹⁷ ?

... ἵστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπέδοκιμάσθη, μετανόιας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὑρεν, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν. '... and you know that although he wanted afterwards to claim the blessing, he was rejected ; for he found no way open for second thoughts, although he strove, to the point of tears, to find one' (N.E.B.).

The point at issue is—To what does the final word *αὐτήν* refer ? Strictly we should expect it to refer to the last-used noun, but it cannot do that since the last noun is the masculine *τόπον*. It must refer to either *εὐλογίαν* or *μετανοίας* ; *εὐλογίαν* is rather far away in a purist's eyes, and *μετανοίας*, though nearer, is part of a noun-phrase rather than standing on its own feet. The Greek is therefore not decisive. The last clause gives the appearance of having been tossed in at the

end of a completed sentence, as often happens in spoken speech.

Translations vary. A.V., R.S.V., and N.E.B. make *αὐτήν* refer to *μετανοίας τόπον* ; R.V. and Knox refer it to *εὐλογίαν*. Commentators also vary, recent writers preferring to refer *αὐτήν* to *μετανοίας*.

Can we read the writer's mind ? Surely we can ! He knows the Genesis story about Esau, and Gn 27³⁴⁻³⁸ makes it clear that it was the blessing which Esau sought with tears. Further, in using *μετανοίας τόπος* the writer is using a standard term (e.g., 2 Esd 9¹¹, Wis 12¹⁰), and on the evidence of such passages he might well be expected to believe that until the moment when God judges mankind there will always be an opportunity for the unrighteous to repent.

Thus, it would appear that *αὐτήν* must be made to refer back to *εὐλογίαν*, and that the difficulty of achieving a neat English sentence which is also a translation must be faced.

I suggest that N.E.B. could be amended by reversing the order of the sentence thus : '... and you know that although he wanted afterwards to claim the blessing, he was rejected ; though he begged for it to the point of tears, he found no way open for second thoughts'. This form of words both preserves the slight ambiguity of the Greek

and avoids N.E.B.'s repetition of 'although' and the introduction of the verb 'to find'.

Bristol

R. TALBOT WATKINS

1691-1961—A Two Hundred and Seventieth Anniversary

The Burning Bush

THE late Professor G. D. Henderson of Aberdeen wrote: 'After the Revolution, the first General Assembly of restored Presbyterianism met in October 1690. George Mossman was appointed printer to the Church. In 1691 he issued "the Principal Acts of the Assembly", and on the title page there appeared—the printer's device of the Burning Bush—and the words "*Nec tamen consumebatur*", the Latin of the translation of Tremellius and Junius in 1579, and not that of the Vulgate' (*The Burning Bush*, 8).

What were the meaning and message of the burning bush in its Biblical context (Ex 3¹⁻⁵)? In the Biblical narrative it was beside the bush which burned with fire and was not consumed that Moses realized he was in the presence of YHWH, Jehovah, the LORD, the God of Israel. There he became conscious that God was calling him to go and bring liberation to an enslaved people. There he received an inward assurance that God would be with him as he went on this mercy-mission to Egypt.

If there were space to quote from the standard critical commentaries on Exodus we would notice how often the words 'divine presence' come

into the expositions of commentators like A. H. McNeile, S. R. Driver, S. L. Brown, J. R. Dummelow, G. Harford, and L. Elliott Binns.

W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson wrote: 'The account of the divine appearance at the burning bush (Ex 3²⁻⁵) contains two conceptions regarding the deity; fire as indicating the divine presence, and a tree as his abode. With the latter compare Dt 33¹⁶ where it speaks baldly of Yahweh as of "Him that dwelt in the bush" (*Hebrew Religion*², 28).

The burning bush is two sacraments in one, a twin-sacrament of the presence and power of God, who promises to be with men as they go to the service of their under-privileged brethren.

ROBERT JOHN WILSON

*The Presbyterian College,
Belfast*

The Varieties of Religious Experience

SIXTY years ago the American psychologist, William James, delivered the Gifford Lectures in Edinburgh on *The Varieties of Religious Experience* during the period when the several Church Assemblies were in progress. The press reports at the time record: '... numerous clergymen of various denominations were present, as well as a considerable body of students...' Would any reader who attended the lectures or has any memories or correspondence about them assist a student of the period by writing to J. C. Kenna, University of Manchester?

J. C. KENNA
Manchester

Recent Foreign Theology

The Church in the New Testament. Professor Eduard Schweizer has written a new work to replace one he published in 1946, now out of print. In it he addresses himself to the question of the Church and its organization in the New Testament.¹ He reviews the relevant material, first in the thought of Jesus, and then successively in Matthew, Luke, the Pastoral Epistles, the Pauline Epistles, the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians, 1 Peter, Hebrews, the Johannine corpus, and the Apostolic Fathers, before turning to his general discussion of the evidence. Here he considers such questions as charismatic and non-charismatic ministry, the universal priesthood of believers, ordination, and Apostolic succession. On all he offers serious contribution to the current wide-

spread discussions, which have assumed a new significance in view of the ecumenical movement, and of the last he finds no solid evidence in the New Testament. While the New Testament lays down no explicit rules for the organization of the Church, its organization should reflect its essential nature, and it is of importance to examine the conception of that essential nature, as it appears in the pages of the New Testament. The author has read widely in the modern literature on this subject, and in the course of his discussion examines many opinions which others have advanced. His reading has included the works of English writers, and the publishers note in the 'blurb' that his *Auseinandersetzung* is particularly with Anglican writers.

¹ *Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testamente*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des A. und N. Testaments, 35 [1959]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich ; Swiss Fr. 20.

The Moabites. It is curious that no monograph on the Moabites had been published until 1960. Now A. H. van Zyl, of the University of Pretoria, has published in English such a monograph in

the Pretoria Oriental Series.¹ The author first collects all the sources for such a study provided by the Old Testament, archaeology, ancient Assyrian and Egyptian texts, Josephus and the Apocrypha, and then studies the topography of Moab with a full account of all the sites of ancient localities found to-day in the land. He then turns to give a connected account of the history of Moab, so far as it can be pieced together from the materials at our disposal. Next he deals with the Moabite language and outlines its grammar. For this he is largely dependent on the Moabite Stone, of which he gives the full text and a translation. Finally he offers a short account of the Moabite religion, so far as it can be learnt from literary references and archaeological finds. While there is little that is new in this monograph, Dr. van Zyl has rendered real service by gathering together in a single volume all the information that is collected here.

Dualism in the Scrolls. A Swiss dissertation by H. W. Huppenbauer is devoted to the question of the dualism of the Dead Sea Scrolls.² In separate chapters the author analyses the dualistic ideas found in the Manual of Discipline, the Habakkuk Commentary, the Zadokite Work, the Hymns, the War Scroll, and the remaining texts from Cave I including the Genesis Apocryphon. In a final chapter the author surveys the whole of the texts, and notes that there is more than one dualism found here. He finds an ethical dualism, a physical-metaphysical dualism, a cosmic dualism, a mythological dualism, and an eschatological dualism. The author has done a very careful piece of work. It is offered as a contribution to the study of the background of the New Testament, and it will repay the study of New Testament students as well as of those who are interested in the Scrolls for their own sake. There is a substantial bibliography at the end of the volume.

Peter and his Roman Grave. Professor P. A. van Stempvoort, of Groningen, has written a small book in Dutch on *Peter and his Grave in Rome*.³ After a brief chapter on what we learn of Peter from the New Testament and from Papias, there is a chapter on Jews and Christians in Rome, resting on classical and patristic sources, followed by one on Clement's account of the death of Peter. The rest of the book—more than half of it—is devoted to an account of the excavations under

¹ *The Moabites* [1960]. Brill, Leiden; Fl. 15.00.

² *Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des A. und N. Testaments*, 34. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Swiss Fr. 19.

³ *Petrus en zijn graf te Rome*. Bosch en Keuning, Baarn; Fl. 2.90.

St. Peter's in Rome, and the evidence of the history of the Church from the middle of the second century that has been brought to light. The book is well illustrated, both with line drawings in the text and with photographs on inset pages.

Revelation 12. An elaborate study of the history of the exegesis of Rev 12 has been prepared by P. Prigent,⁴ who observes that the difficulties attaching to this chapter make it the touchstone of the different systems of interpretation. The author traverses the exegesis of the chapter from Hippolytus to the present time, though so many expositors have to be taken account of that none can receive more than brief treatment. What is brought out is the variety of types of interpretation. Some have interpreted it in terms of the history that lay behind the author, some in terms of the history that lay before him, and some in purely eschatological terms. Some have given a mariological exegesis, while others have sought to find the origin of the conceptions in the chapter in the history of religions. In a brief concluding chapter the author offers his own views. Here most interest attaches to his opinion that vv. 10–12 are a Christian hymn which the author combined with two or three fragments of Jewish origin so skilfully that he has made a unity of the whole.

The Book of Chronicles. The successive volumes of the Dutch Catholic Commentary, edited by A. van den Born, W. Grossouw, and J. van der Ploeg, have been noted in these columns as they appeared, and the speed with which they have succeeded one another has been remarked on. Dr. van den Born has himself written several of the volumes, and has now added to their number the Commentary on 1 and 2 Chronicles.⁵ There is a new translation of the book, with a full commentary standing beneath it, together with a list, at the end of the volume, of the textual changes on which the translation is based. There are also many pages of genealogical tables at the end, setting out in visual form the family lists in which the Chronicler is interested. The Introduction is brief, occupying about ten pages. The author rejects the ascription of the book to two authors, and holds that it is substantially a unity, with some secondary passages. He assigns the date of the Chronicler's work to the latter half of the fourth century B.C. or the beginning of the third.

Manchester

H. H. ROWLEY

⁴ *Apocalypse 12. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 2* [1959]. Mohr, Tübingen; DM 17.

⁵ *Kronieken. De Boeken van het Oude Testament*, V. i. [1960]. Romen en Zonen, Roermond en Maseik.

Entre Nous

Light out of Darkness

It sometimes happens that we cannot understand the poetry without knowing at least something of the poet. It is that way with a very outstanding volume of verse—*The Map of Clay*, by Jack Clemo (Methuen; 12s. 6d. net). In a brief Introduction Charles Causley tells us something of Jack Clemo.

Born in 1916, Jack Clemo still lives in a little cottage on Goonamaris Slip in the country of the Cornish china-clay industry. It is a district where there is little beauty, and where the great clay-pits and all their paraphernalia of used and disused machinery disfigure the land. A less likely habitat for a poet it would be hard to imagine. Jack Clemo himself has suffered from attacks of blindness at the age of five, of thirteen, and since 1955. At the age of eighteen he became deaf, and now, although he can distinguish sounds, he cannot hear voices. He is a man on whom the prison walls have seemed slowly and inexorably to close.

And yet he is a man who has remained undefeated. In faith he is a Calvinist. His one sustaining conviction is that all that has come to him has come to test him. And in his blindness he has refused even to learn Braille, for to learn it would have been, as he sees it, a confession that faith has failed and that the light has gone for ever. Jack Clemo is, in spite of everything, vividly and in the most catholic sense intellectually and spiritually alive. In his room stand side by side photographs of Billy Graham and T. F. Powys; in his bookcase there are volumes of Spurgeon and D. H. Lawrence, Karl Barth and Coventry Patmore, and the Browning love letters. Among the poems in this volume are poems addressed to C. H. Spurgeon, T. F. Powys, D. H. Lawrence, Karl Barth, Søren Kierkegaard, Thomas Hardy, Monica Hutchings, and yet the last thing that anyone could call his poetry is derivative.

The election of God runs through it :

Our love is full-grown Dogma's offspring,
Election's child,
Making the wild
Heats of our blood an offering.

The romantic poets are not for him :

There is no worship here, only the worm I call
Original sin, and fire of the Fall.
Worm and fire at my roots, how should I know
Your sunshine, song of birds, you poet brood ?
How should I share your pagan glow ?

And yet for him heaven is near :

I have a soul, a field ever bared
To the Heaven of miracle.

It is in the desolation of the clay-pits that he finds God :

I have lost all the sensitive, tender,
Deep insights of man :
I will look round a claywork in winter,
And note what I can.

So he sees there :

The quarry's yield : a lone crowbar
A pulley-frame, a can of tar,
Wheelbarrows soft in puffy gloom,
Or trolley-rope's cold flaky plume
A waggon-track with white ribbed prongs
Spanning a crevice : here belongs,
In these weird aisles of ghostly stone,
Humility of symbols' bone.

And there he finds Christ :

I see His blood
In rusty stains on pit-props, waggon-frames
Bristling with nails, not leaves.

He writes of the great scholars who toil at :

The narrow text that yields infinity,
The knotted currents at the fountain-head,
The Pauline affirmations—perilous deeps
Where labouring seekers track the godhead still
Dynamic in disguise.

He has one poem of amazing insight in which he addresses Thomas Hardy. He says of Hardy :

You laboured with the unwindowed word,
Blindly submissive, greyly passionate.

You drew
Back to the negative release,
The closed curtain and the folded doubt.

Hardy's trouble was that he did not see 'another Tree in the wasteland'.

Then there comes the conclusion :
There at your gate I had surmized
How far the Tree may cast its healing thrill
Behind the curtained guesswork, the fear-numbed will.
And in the twilight, looking back
In lapses on my frontier track,
I almost could conceive
That to blaspheme with tears is to believe.

Here is a book which is indeed kindled by the authentic flame, and in which the ancient Muses and the living God come together.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK,
38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested
that all literary communications be addressed to
THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.